ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED001361

2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). N.A.

3. IDENTIFICATION NO. CR-1082

4. AUTHOR(S): Biddle, Bruce J., and others

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher, Vol. D: Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Social Psychology Laboratory,
ST. University of Missouri,
CITY, STATE Columbia, Missouri
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Cooperative Research Program, Office of Education, Department of HEW, Washington, D.C.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	1/63	123

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BEL

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

	coding instruments	cognition measurements
role theory	teacher's role	coded bibliographies
measurement techniques	public schools	variables
measurement instruments		role methodology

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

At present, role theory is moving toward a more eminent position in sociology. Role theory has definite and basic distinctions with respect to persons, number, background, characteristics, and cognitions. The bibliographic studies of previous research in the role area are presented. Focus is on the previous use of role methodology and propositional structure in role theory. Coding instruments used are explained. Conclusions are set forth explaining propositionary structures in role theory as well as reasons for the scarcity of such propositions. An extensive coded bibliography is presented for role propositions. Numerous figures, tables and charts are included in the text.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES ON ROLE METHODOLOGY AND PROPOSITIONS

by

Bruce J. Biddle
Project Director

George Barger

William Bennett, Jr.

Daniel Hays

Roger Miller

Sue Titus

Volume D - STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

Social Psychology Laboratory
The University of Missouri
Columbia
January, 1962

Conducted under Contracts with the Cooperative Research Program
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

at

The University of Kansas City and The University of Missouri

Initial distribution of this report has been made to the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and copies of it may be obtained on loan from depository libraries of the program.

Additional copies may be purchased from the University of Missouri Press, Building T-2, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Acknowledgements

Although the authors alone are responsible for what is said in this monograph, many others have helped in its preparation. Thanks are due to Theodore M. Newcomb, John R. P. French, Jr., Roger Barker, Neal Gross, and Richard Videbeck for ideational influence. Jerome Hulehan, Earl F. Rankin, Jr., Howard A. Rosencranz, Edward Tomich, and J. Paschal Twyman have contributed towards the preparation of materials abstracted in the monograph. Thalia Dooley and Janet Wall typed the manuscript.

FOREWORD

In July 1958, a program of research on the role of the public school teacher was inaugurated at The University of Kansas City. This program has had three broad objectives:

1. To pursue role theory and aid in its development as a sophisticated system of analysis in social psychology.
2. To study extensively and empirically the role of the public school teacher.
3. To explore the relationships between teacher role and the problems of teacher recruitment.

These objectives have required a variety of activities. To date, staff members have engaged in: (a) The development of a consistent set of terms and distinctions applicable to role theory; (b) The systematic review of the published literature on role theory and on empirical studies of educational roles; (c) The development of a methodology applicable to the study of roles; and (d) The collection of interview data from respondents in the Kansas City metropolitan area in three field studies covering aspects of the role of the public school teacher.

In part, this research program has been supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through two research contracts, one granted to the University of Kansas City and one granted to the University of Missouri to which the project moved in September 1960. Additional support of the program is now being provided by the Office of Naval Research (Group Psychology Branch).

This volume is one of several which are submitted to the Cooperative Research Program as a Final Report. It is concerned with three bibliographic studies of previous research in the role area. Included are studies of the previous use of role methodology and propositional structure in role theory.

Other Final Report volumes are also available from this research program. These are organized into two series. The numerical series deals with findings from our empirical investigations of teacher role in Kansas City. The alphabetic series is concerned with role theory, methods, and bibliographic reviews. A general outline of reports either already available or in preparation is provided in Figure i.1 on the following page.

Three additional bibliographic studies were prepared in the research program and are reported in Volume B (see Figure i.1). In many ways these two volumes are similar and should be read consecutively.

Bruce J. Biddle
George Barger
William Bennett, Jr.
Daniel Hays
Roger Miller
Sue Titus
January, 1962

GENERAL OUTLINE - STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

Part I - THEORETICAL, METHODOLOGICAL AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDIES

*A - The Present Status of Role Theory

*B - Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role Conflict, and the Role of the Teacher

*C - A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences

*D - Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions

Part II - EMPIRICAL REPORTS

*1 - Orientation, Methods and Materials

*2 - General Characteristics of the School Teacher's Role

*3 - Positional Differences in Teacher Role

*4 - Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice

*5 - Own and Attributed Cognitions for the Teacher

6 - Recognition and Resolution of Role Conflict Among Teachers (Summer, 1962)

7 - Teacher Cognitions and Teacher Behavior (Summer, 1962)

i.1

---

*Studies marked with an asterisk are presently available. Unmarked studies are in preparation. Additional empirical reports (not listed) will also be prepared during 1962.

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword i

General Outline - Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher iii

Table of Contents iv

List of Tables vi

Chapter I - THE BASIC DISTINCTIONS OF ROLE THEORY

Introduction 1

Basic Elements 3
- Persons 4
- Number 4
- Backgrounds 6
- Characteristics 7
- Cognitions 8

Summary 9

Chapter II - THE METHODS OF EMPIRICAL ROLE STUDIES

Introduction 11

Basic Techniques of Cognitive Measurement 11

The Coding Instrument 13

A Coding Illustration 17

Results 18
- Cognitions Studied 18
- Techniques of Measurement 19
- Instruments Used 20
- Sources of Framework 21
- Backgrounds Used 23
- Person Usage 23

Summary 28

The Coded Bibliography 29

Chapter III - PROPOSITIONAL STRUCTURE IN ROLE THEORY

Introduction 63

Methods 63
- General Criteria 63
- Codes for Simple Variables 64
- Operators 65

Codes for Constructed Variables 66

Bibliographic Conventions 74

Variables Involved in Propositions 75
    Variables Used 75
    Overall Popularity of the Variables 77
    Usage in Tested vs. Non-Tested Propositions 79
    Dependent vs. Independent Variable Usage 83

Propositions Using Coded Role Variables Only 85

Propositions Using Non-Coded Role Variables 85

Propositions Using Non-Role Variables 86
    Happiness or Satisfaction 86
    Happiness with Others and Successful Social Activity 88
    Empirical Status of 'Success' and 'Happiness' 89

Conclusions 90

A Coded Bibliography of Role Propositions 93

List of Tables

Number Page

2.1 The Coding Instrument 14

2.2 Techniques of Measurement versus Types of Cognition 19

2.3 Instruments Used to Measure Types of Cognition 20

2.4 Sources of Framework versus Types of Cognition 22

2.5 Background versus Type of Cognition 23

2.6 Categories of Subjects Used to Measure Cognitions. 24

2.7 Categories of Objects Used in Measuring Cognitions 25

2.8 Categories of Sentient Objects Used in Measuring Second Order Cognitions 26

3.1 Propositions Containing Basic Element Variables as Independent Variables 76

3.2 Propositions Containing Comparison-Variables as Independent Variables. . 78

3.3 Propositions Containing Consensus Variables as Independent Variables . . 80

3.4 Propositions Containing Other Variables as Independent Variables 82

3.5 Usage of Role and Non-Role Variables in Tested and Untested Propositions and as Independent and Dependent Variables 84

CHAPTER I

THE BASIC DISTINCTIONS OF ROLE THEORY

Introduction

Role theory offers a unique challenge to the social investigator in 1960. On one hand, role theory is moving towards a position of increasing importance in both sociology and social psychology. Literally hundreds of titles have appeared in the literature in the last decade making reference to role theory. Major theoretical works appear which are based directly upon or draw heavily from role theory. Empirical studies by the score, articles, monographs and dissertations demonstrate the usefulness of this frame of reference in generating communicable data. And - an acid test - the fertility of role theory has been attested to by the group dynamics practitioner, the adult educator, the leadership trainer and others interested in the practical applications of social science.

On the other hand, there is perhaps no field in all of social science today with as little consensus among investigators as to what its terms are, what they mean, or indeed, with what phenomena the theory is concerned. Major contributors speak of patterns of behavior or of norms or of expectations; of groups, positions, statuses or roles; of sanctions, consensus, or functional significance; of ego, actor, subject, judge or "P" - often using the same terms interchangeably - with great generation of insight but little explicit communication with one another. Indeed, it may be maintained that role theory seems to have achieved popularity because of its many useful connotations rather than its specific denotations.

This does not imply that role theory does not have central foci. On the contrary, wherever used, role theory usually concerns patterns of behavior which are common to sets of social actors and the cognitive phenomena which underlie these patterns. To speak wtth insight about these phenomena, especially in an age when many persons did not recognize their existence, was a necessary task and one similar to the formative stage of any science. That we have outgrown this early stage, however, seems clear as we move towards the empirical measurement of role phenomena.

Despite the growing popularity of role theory, there appear at least three problems standing in the way of this area becoming a truly theoretical structure. These are: (1) Lack of agreement on concepts rightfully belonging in this area; (2) Lack of agreement on terms applying to these concepts; and (3) Lack of a logico-deductive, propositional structure based upon conceptual distinctions but independent of them.

Recognition of these problems has been almost universal in publications appearing in the last decade. Unfortunately, recognition has not been followed by the appearance of a system of universally accepted distinctions. A typical article in role theory proceeds from the recognition of confusion to a re-definition of all previously used terms so as to express the legitimate insights of the author, thus adding still more connotations and confusion. Recently, however, there have been some serious attempts to clear up the problem. Reviews of the field have emphasized the many dimensions of meaning dealt with in role theory (5), (9). Rommetveit (8) and Parsons (6),(7) have each stated and used a consistent series of distinctions, while Gross et al. (3) have begun the assembly of a series of interrelated propositions in role theory. Unfortunately, there is only partial overlap among these systems, and none has as yet received universal acceptance.

In attempting to plan an empirical study of the role of the public school teacher, the authors of this volume developed a system of terms and concepts which seems to encompass many of the distinctions found in role theory. The system was originally developed as a propositional and methodological guide. We felt constrained however, to examine its utility in dealing with the published literature.

Accordingly, when we had occasion to develop five bibliographies in the area of role theory and the empirical study of teacher role, efforts were made to annotate and code all entries in terms of the system developed. The tables and findings resulting from this process have enabled us both to assess the utility of the conceptual system and to understand the coverage of previous literature.

The first three bibliographic studies are reported in Volume B of this series, BIBLIOGRAPHIES ON ROLE TERMS, ROLE CONFLICT, AND THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER. The present volume takes up two additional topics, the methods of empirical role studies, (Chapter II) and the propositional structure of role theory (Chapter III).

This first chapter is devoted to a partial presentation of the conceptual system we have found useful. Summarized here are only those distinctions in role theory needed for the two bibliographic studies which are found in this volume. Other distinctions are made in Volume B, while a broad statement of the complete theory may be found in Volume A - THE PRESENT STATUS OF ROLE THEORY.

It should be understood that despite the wide variety of definitions which have appeared in role theory, there are only a few primitive concepts involved in these definitions. In this chapter primitive terms will be defined and conventions for coding propositions and definitions that use basic elements of the system will be set forth. Supplementary discussions of higher-order concepts and propositions will be found in Chapters II and III.

Basic Elements

The basic elements of the present system may be conveniently categorized as concerning:

1) persons.

2) number.

3) backgrounds.

4) characteristics.

5) cognitions.

Persons. Five classes of persons may be distinguished. These are:

1. Object - an actor, a person who exhibits behavior. Whenever social action takes place, it is exhibited by an object. (O)*

2. Target - a person towards whom behavior is directed. A target must be, in some sense, in the physical presence of an object, but he need not be aware that the behavior is being directed towards himself. (T)

3. Audience - all persons present when an object behaves, other than the object and the target. An audience member does not necessarily have to perceive a given behavior, but must be psysically capable of doing so. (A)

4. Subject - a person who is presumed to hold cognitions about a social situation; more specifically, about an object. (S)

5. Sentient-object - a person who is imputed by a subject to hold cognitions about a social situation and more specifically about an object. It is,of course, not necessary that the sentient-object actually hold these cognitions. (S-O)

Neither the subject nor the sentient-object need be in the relevant social situation, though they may. It is possible, for instance, that the sentient-object and the object are the same person; or that the subject is also the target. The object, at any one time, cannot be the target, of course, nor can the sentient-object be the subject, unless one is dealing with multi-person objects, targets, and so on.

Number. Propositions (and, presumably, actual social cognitions) often deal in generalizations about people and about patterns of behavior and patterns of cognitions assumed to be characteristic of more than one person. The number distinctions made here are:

1. Person - a single human being. (per)

2. Human collectivity - a set of persons greater than one. (hcl)

---

* The abbreviation for each element follows its definition.

3. Group - a set of persons, such that each person at one time or another is in an object-target relationship with each other member. (grp)

4. Position - a set of persons whose delineation is in terms of behaviors exhibited and received or about whom similar behaviors are cognized. (p)

The first two definitions are straightforward and simple. Group and position are not merely concepts about 'how many,' however. The concept 'group' specifies interaction; and the definition of 'position' involves behaviors or cognitions.

The term set in the definition of position (and in all other definitions in this paper) is used in the mathematical sense. The number of entities (in this case, persons) in a set is unspecified: there may be one person or many, or even no persons--an 'empty set' is possible.

A set of persons greater than one is a position if the members exhibit similar behaviors or if similar behaviors are directed towards them by others or if similar cognitions are held about them. A set of persons with one member is a position if similar behaviors are directed toward him by others, or if a delineable pattern of behaviors is cognized for him that in some way differentiates this person from others. A set of persons with no members (an empty set) may be a position also; in this case the defining quality must be cognitions of others. The king may be dead, for instance, but the position of 'king' still exists.

Any position may also have labelling cognition attached to it, such as 'school teacher' or 'president of the Bixby Machine Parts Company.' It is possible that commonly labelled positions may differ in some respects from commonly non-labelled positions.

A position may be a group, though not all positions are. Nor are all groups positions as defined above. All groups, but not all positions, are human collectivities.

Another term found helpful is social system (s). It is close in meaning to the term group, but may be used when it is necessary to refer to more complex organization that the concepts group or position will allow. It refers to some human collectivity such that there are two or more delineable groups, or two or more interacting positions.

Backgrounds. Every social behavior is in some background, or context. The importance of background may be minimal, but in some cases it is not. For instance, norms for clothes-wearing at the beach are decidedly distinct from norms concerning clothes at a formal dinner party.

Among the types of backgrounds are:

1. Setting - a designated portion of physical space and its contents, both animate and inanimate, constituting a unit realm in which behavior can take place. The distinctions between objects and settings and between settings and larger units of physical space are culturally determined. (st)

2. Social situation - a designated pattern of social behavior tending to involve all persons in a given setting and reappearing at stated intervals over time. A given social situation may be found in a variety of settings. (ss)

3. Time of day - self-explanatory. (ti)

Other types of backgrounds are distinguishable, but less often used in the literature. Among these are fracto-situations, position-sets, institutional structure, history, and shared culture. A fracto-situation is a portion of a social situation prepotent enough to acquire a designation of its own; e.g., a street-fight. A position-set is a particular set of persons or positions members present in a situation such that in effect they constitute a background element; e.g., two policemen standing silently in a tavern. History refers to the context and effects of what has happened before, both in regard to the participants apart from the situation and to the participants in the situation. Shared culture and institutional structure, as background elements, may be taken in their common sociological usage.

Still another sort of context for social action has to do with the directionality of behavior, or the notion of endstate.

4. Endstate - a point on a behavioral framework such that the present behavior of an individual or a collectivity 'tends toward' that point. (e-s)

An endstate is a fairly low-order construct, and assumes nothing about 'purpose' or 'goal' or similar 'motivation,' though it is similar in meaning to them. Endstates, and the sequences of behavior that lead to endstates, are not necessarily background or context--for instance, it is possible to define a 'role' in terms of endstates. However, endstates may be treated as backgrounds, and will be here.

Characteristics. There are at least two characteristics of persons which may be observed or cognized:

1. Behavior - an event bounded in time consisting of an action taken by a given object person. Behaviors may be either directed or non-directed. If the former, they may be directed toward social targets or towards non-social aspects of the physical world. Behaviors are assumed to be meaningful in some way, and are usually assumed to be volitional. (beh)

2. Feature - an event relatively unbounded in time consisting of an enduring physical characteristic of a given object person. Features are passive, non-directed, and in themselves are not volitional (though in the history of a feature there may have been volitional behavior, such as plastic surgery). (ftr)

A third concept, trait, is in some ways similar to a characteristic, though it is in fact a sort of cognition.

3. Trait - any cognitively identified aspect of a person or position which is presumed to be independent of background. (trt)

Many adjectives are trait-cognitions; e.g., 'sailors are wild.' Imputed cognitive structures, such as attitudes, abilities, and motivations, if treated as relatively permanent, background-free hypothetical constructs standing behind

behavior are traits also. 'Frozen' patterns of behavior (e.g.,"teenagers drive too fast") can be traits; as can historical events (e.g., "He went to Harvard").

Cognitions. Two levels of cognition are dealt with in the present system, though other levels can be extrapolated.

The term first-order cognition refers to cognitions which are maintained by observers about real world social events, that is, about events which consist of real human characteristics which are public property and can be observed by anyone. By cognition is meant some sort of reality-oriented or value-oriented mapping structure which is presumed to be maintained by an individual who participates in social situations. Cognitions are modelled after real world events but are not necessarily isomorphic with them. Among other things, cognitions serve to structure the behavior of the individual.

Among the types of first-order cognitions are:

1. Perception - the cognitive mapping by a person of a particular real world event in the present, or relatively simultaneous to the event. (P)

2. Expectation - a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of a subjective probability map concerned with the incidence of a set of characteristics for an object-person or position. The characteristics in question are beyond the immediate perceptual range of the cognizer. (E)

3. Norm - a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of an evaluative (or approval) map about the varieties of possible characteristics for an object-person or position. (N)

The term cognition (C) will be used to indicate a lack of clarity by an author in specifying just what sort of cognition he is referring to. It will also be used to code cognitions other than the ones defined above--e.g., cognitions of legitimacy--with the type of cognition indicated by a note.

In addition to cognitions about real world events, a subject may hold cognitions about the cognitions of others. These are called second-order cognitions.

The varieties of second-order cognitions used in the present system are:

1. Attributed expectation - the cognitive mapping by a subject of an expectation thought to be held by some sentient-object or sentient-object collectivity. (AE)

2. Attributed norm - the cognitive mapping by a subject of a norm thought to be held by some sentient-object or sentient-object collectivity. (AN)

3. Ausvalued expectation - a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of an evaluative map about an expectation. (VE)

4. Ausvalued norm - a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of an evaluative map about a norm. (VN)

Any cognition may be differentiated from any other cognition of the same type in terms of content: e.g., an expectation about secretaries taking coffee breaks and an expectation about secretaries typing memos. A cognition of any given content is differentiated within itself in terms of scale value on a content framework: e.g., an expectation concerned with the subjective probability of secretaries taking a few coffee breaks or a lot of coffee breaks. Thus, cognitions are conceived as two-dimensional distributions which report cognitive strength (measured as subjective probability for expectations or approval for norms) for each scale point of a framework dealing with characteristics of the object. A fuller discussion of content and scale value may be found in Volume A.

Summary

A basic set of concepts has been set forth for role theory involving five major dimensions; person, number, background, characteristic, and cognition. The system is minimal in two respects. First of all, it is limited to those distinctions which are necessary for the two bibliographic studies reported in this volume. Secondly, it ignores distinctions or additions which have been placed in role theory by some authors. For instance, to require sanctioning, functional significance, attribution of consensus, or a minimal level of sharing of expectations or norms to consider the phenomenon worthy of definition under the rubric of role theory is foreign to the system proposed. On the other hand, these additional stipulations are expressible in the system.

Chapter II deals with the methods which have been used in empirical studies of role. Chapter III reports upon propositions which have been isolated in both empirical and theoretical role publications. Both Chapters extend the basic conceptual system outlined here.

CHAPTER II

THE METHODS OF EMPIRICAL ROLE STUDIES

Introduction

It has been shown in previous bibliographic studies (Volume B) that wide-spread confusion exists in role theory over what is being studied and choice of terms to deal with it. Is it possible that this confusion is confined to theoretical realms and that empirical investigations in the role field show more focus or sophistication? Have investigators of role tended to focus upon a single methodology, or have methods of role investigation exhibited as much variety as the concepts and terms which produced them?

To answer these questions the authors have examined and reviewed more than 400 references reporting empirical studies in the role field. Of this large group, 123 studies were found to be sufficiently clear in their discussion of methods to warrant analysis. A code was then developed which summarized the techniques authors used to measure role cognitions. With this instrument the references were coded and coded materials tabulated and analyzed. This chapter reports the results of this analysis together with the coded bibliography.

Basic Techniques of Cognitive Measurement

It will be recalled from Chapter I that role cognitions are conceived of as two-dimensional distributions which report the degree of cognitive strength (measured as subjective probability or approval) for each point of a framework dealing with characteristics of the object. Such a two-dimensional figure may only be fully measured by complex techniques; for instance, asking a respondent to give a number of cognitive strength ratings for each of the points of the chosen framework. Such a multi-questioned technique will be termed here a complete method.

In practice, most investigators have chosen to short-cut complex methods with simpler techniques based upon 'reasonable' assumptions. In what may be termed the cognitive strength method, the respondent is asked to indicate his level of approval (or subjective probability) for a selected point of the framework. Thus, the respondent may be asked to estimate how many teachers 'smoke' or to give his approval (or disapproval) for 'smoking.' In the cognitive strength method no other questions dealing with the chosen framework are asked; hence the designated point is assumed to be contrasted with all other points for that framework. This amounts to an additional assumption that the designated point is but one out of two possibilities which exhaust the framework. (The only 'reasonable' alternatives to 'smoking' is 'not smoking.') If other alternatives are conceived, such as 'smoking a great deal,' then the cognitive strength method gives results which cannot be interpreted.

In contrast, in the modal point method the respondent is asked to give that point of a framework which corresponds with his modal expectation, positive norm, or negative norm. Respondents are asked to estimate 'how much smoking' is actually done by teachers, they would approve for teachers, or they would most disapprove. The modal point method also depends upon assumptions, the respondent's ability to discriminate a modal point and the adequacy of modal point representation of the cognitive distribution, for instance. This latter method is actually quite unreasonable when more than a single mode may be present in the cognitive distribution - as is quite often the case with negative norms.

Contrasts may be made between the cognitive strength and modal point techniques. The former stresses the measurement of commensurable strength functions and is most useful for comparing various cognitions which differ in content. The latter, stressing measurements upon a given framework, is most useful when comparing various types of cognition within a given content area. In general, the assumptions of the modal point method are less repugnant than those of the cognitive strength method - except for the measurement of negative norms. Measures made by either technique may be 'translated' into equivalent measures using the other technique only by stringent (and often incorrect) assumptions. Neither technique adequately substitutes for the complete measurement of a role cognition, although both methods may be coded from the common language while the complete method requires at least a depth interviewing approach.

Finally, a primitive method is also used for the measurement of role cognitions. In this last method a respondent gives a statement in which cognitive strength and framework points are reported but neither is differentiated from other possibilities. Thus, respondents are asked to agree or disagree with the statement,'teachers smoke.' The primitive method represents a reduction of either the cognitive strength or modal point methods to its most basic form, and it suffers from the assumptions and shortcomings of both of the better methods.

The Coding Instrument

The coding instrument (see Table 2.1) was divided into three major sections.

Section I focused upon the type of cognition being measured. Capital letter abbreviations were used to indicate the concept being measured by the author's methods. If the author used a term other than the one specified by our theoretical discussion for the concept measured, the term used by the author was noted parenthetically in a subscript. If the author did not give any specific term for the concept he measured, dashes were noted parenthetically in a subscript. Omission of a subscript indicated that the author used the terminology of this study. A final dimension included in Section I was that of consensus which was coded with arabic numbers as a supra-postscript. Definitions of the three types of consensus coded are included in Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1

THE CODING INSTRUMENT

Section I. Type of Cognition

E	Expectation--a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of a subjective probability map concerned with the incidence of a set of behaviors for an object-person or position.
AE	Attributed Expectation--expectations about the expectations of others. (a second order cognition)
VE	Ausvalued Expectation--normative statements about others' expectations.
N	Norm--a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of an affective map about the varieties of possible behaviors for an object-person or position.
AN	Attributed Norm--expectations about the norms of others (second order cognition).
VN	Ausvalued Norm--normative statements about the norms of others.
beh	Behavior--an event bounded in time consisting of a meaningful action taken by a given object person. Behaviors are active and are presumed to be volitional. They may be either directed or non-directed. If the former, they may be directed towards social targets or towards non-social aspects of the physical world.
ftr	Feature--an event relatively unbounded in time consisting of an enduring physical characteristic of a given object person. Features are passive, non-directed, and are not presumed to be volitional.
trt	Trait--a cognition maintained for a given object which is presumed to be independent of background.

Sub ( )--author's original term, if different from the terminology of this study.

Supra--(nature of the consensus)

1. Accurate Shared Consensus--You and I hold the same cognitions and attribute the correct cognitions to each other.

2. Sharing--You and I hold the same cognitions but do not attribute the correct cognitions to each other.

3. Attributed Shared Consensus--You and I attribute the same cognitions to each other but do not actually share the same cognitions.

Section II. Methodological Operation

A. Type of cognition scale used

Type I--Complete Method. "I think___teachers smoke___much."
- a. Only one question of this type is asked.
- b. Several questions of this type are asked.

Table 2.1 (Continued)

Type II--Cognitive Strength Method. "I think ___teachers smoke."
Type III---Modal Point Method. "I think teachers smoke ___ much."
Type IV--Primitive Method. "I think teachers smoke."

B. Background specification. Coded Pre-Supra.

st Physical setting--a designated portion of physical space and its contents (including both objects, animate and inanimate, and space free of solid or liquid matter) constituting a unit realm in which behavior can take place.

ss Social situation--a designated pattern of social behavior tending to involve all persons in a given setting and reappearing at stated intervals of time. Because of their inclusive character, social situations occur one at a time within any given setting, but a given social situation may be found in a variety of settings.

ps ps Position set--presence of position members which might influence the behavior. Ex. Principal enters room during the class period.

C. Type of Testing Instruments. Coded Post-Supra.

OQ Open-ended questionnaire--any questionnaire in which the complete answer was to be supplied by the respondent. For example, "What would you do in ___ situation?"

CQ Closed type questionnaire--any questionnaire in which the respondents answers were limited to those suggested by the investigator. A closed type questionnaire implies that a cognition is held at a single level by the respondents. Therefore, this instrument cannot be used in measuring a complete two-dimensional cognition.

CS Card sort--the respondent is given a set of cards and asked to separate them into a given number of piles indicative of cognitional alternatives.

IT Interview--the investigator's recording of the oral responses given to him by the respondent in reply to questions directed by him toward the respondent.

OB Observed behavior--cognitions inferred by the investigator as a result of observing the behavior of the subject.

PO Participant observation--cognitions inferred by the investigator as a result of observing the behavior of the subject. But in this case, the investigator participates in the behavior.

D. Source of Framework Coded post-sub.

1. Volunteered by respondents
2. Suggested by expert informants
3. Obtained from literauure
4. Derived from theory
5. Furnished by author on basis of observation
6. Furnished by author in form of a theoretical situation

Table 2.1 (Continued)

Section III. Person Specification

Subject--an individual or group holding cognitions about an object.
Object--person or group who exhibits behaviors or attributes, or about whom cognitions are held.
Sentient Object--the object to whom is imputed an attribute or cognition.
Target--person towards whom the behavior of an object is directed.
Audience--persons in whose presence imputed attributed or cognitions occur.

Section II coded the acutal methodological operations performed in the study. The basic type of cognitive measurement was indicated by a Roman numeral. A supra-postscript code to the left of this numeral indicated background specifications if they were included. The type of testing instrument (open-ended questionnaire, interview, card sort, etc.)was coded in a supra-postscript to the right of the Roman numeral. A final dimension--the theoretical framework on which the empirical investigation was based--was coded as a subscript. Arabic numerals were used as indicators (see Table 2.1).

In some instances a particular dimension was implied although not specified. In such cases, the dimension was coded within small brackets. Omission of a part of the code indicated that the dimension was neither specified nor implied.

Section III indicated the person specification of the study. Because of the variety of persons utilized in the 123 studies, a code was not feasible for this dimension. The categories of position members were designated within large brackets (as contrasted with the smaller brackets used as above), the lines of which indicated the five person specification.

Line 1--subject
Line 2--object
Line 3--sentient object
Line 4--target
Line 5--audience

A dash above a line indicated the omission of that particular person specification.

A Coding Illustration

An example of an empirical study with its code will aid in understanding the different facets of the complete instrument.

Basing his study on previous theory, an experimenter devised an instrument for measuring 'attitudes.' The instrument was administered individually to a group of college students. A sample question from his study is as follows: "If you observe a fellow cheating on a test, would you approve of his conduct? Yes or No." This would be coded as follows:

$N_{\text{(attitude)}}$

$$\text{ss} \quad \text{IV} \quad \genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{\text{CQ}}{4}$$

college students
self
--
--
--

An explanation of the code follows:

1. The author of the article tested norms (which he called attitudes). The cognitions were held by the individuals themselves, with no reference to similar or dissimilar cognition of others. That is, consensus was not specified or implied.

2. The code (ss) indicates that the cognition was held within a social situation (students in a classroom).

3. The code (CQ) indicates that a closed questionnaire was used in measuring the cognition.

4. The code (4) indicates that the investigator derived his framework from some theoretical formulations relating to this area.

5. The writing in large brackets indicates that the respondents (college students) were asked only about their norms concerning the conduct in question and not about the norms held by their fellow students. Therefore, the student is the subject and the object. No target, sentient object, or audience is included.

It can be seen that the coding instrument leaves some things unstated. It does not discuss non-cognitive measurements made in connection with those coded. It does not deal with the propositional structure. It does not list examples of the actual questions used by the investigator. Finally, it does not indicate the size of the respondent group.

Results*

The majority of references reviewed for this chapter reported the independent measurement of more than one kind of role cognition. Altogether, 224 independent measurements were reported in the 123 coded references.

Cognitions Studied. In Tables 2.2 through 2.8 various aspects of methodology are displayed against type of cognition studied by investigators. It will be observed that the cognition type categories used consist entirely of simple cognitive concepts. Thus, it is reported that expectations, norms, attributed expectations, attributed norms, ausvalued expectations, ausvalued norms, and behaviors (as operational definitions of role cognitions) were studied. This classification represents a compromise. It had been intended to report methods used for investigation of various derived concepts (such as conformity, optimism, or sharing), but studies in which clear techniques were adopted to these purposes were few in number. In contrast, a number of investigators have apparently 'assumed' the presence of derived phenomena (particularly forms of consensus) either in their discussion or in the instructions which they gave respondents. Altogether, 48 of the 224 reported techniques made such assumptions with sharing being assumed in 30 cases. To solve these problems it was decided to tabulate results only in terms of the 'basic' role variable being studied.

---

*Results of the analysis for terms used in empirical studies are reported in Volume B, Chapter III.

It will be observed in Table 2.2 that the majority of reported studies have focused upon first order cognitions, while in both first and second order cognitions the expectational (or attributed) orientation has predominated over the normative. Altogether, only three ausvalued techniques are reported among the 224 summarized in Table 2.2.

TABLE 2.2

TECHNIQUES OF MEASUREMENT VERSUS TYPES OF COGNITION

Techniques	Types of Cognition							
	Expectations	Norms	Attributed Expectations	Attributed Norms	Ausvalued Expectations	Ausvalued Norms	Behavior	Totals
Complete	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	4
Cognitive Strength	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	6
Modal Point	48	40	27	10	1	1	5	132
Primitive	32	24	14	5	-	1	1	77
None and Combination*	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	5
Totals	90	64	45	16	1	2	6	224

*Included within this row were techniques which did not give enough information for a discrimination to be made or those which used more than one type of technique.

Techniques of Measurement. Table 2.2 also reports the techniques which were used by investigators for the measurement of cognitions. It will be noted that very few complete or cognitive strength techniques were used and that the modal point technique accounted for approximately 60% of all techniques reported. The dominance of this technique reflects the fact that in the majority of studies investigators were concerned with comparing two or more types of cognitions drawn from the same frameworks (usually comparisons between similar cognitions held by two subject positions or comparable first and second order cognitions). On the other hand, many investigators appeared unaware of alternate methods of measurement which might have been adopted. In particular, the lack of studies reporting complete measurement of role cognitions is to be deplored. Table 2.2 suggests no consistent relationship between type of cognition measured and technique of measurement used by previous investigators.

Instruments Used. Table 2.3 reports the varieties of instruments used by various investigators to measure role cognitions. In interpreting this table it may be assumed that open-ended questionnaire and interview techniques - as a rule - allowed for the expression of content by the respondent. In contrast, closed type questionnaires and card sorts imposed content upon the respondent

TABLE 2.3

INSTRUMENTS USED TO MEASURE TYPES OF COGNITION

Instruments Types of Cognition

	Expec-tations	Norms	Attribut-ed Expec tations	Attribu-ted Norms	Ausvalued Expecta-tions	Ausvalued Norms	Behavior	Totals
Open-ended Ques-tionnaire	14	15	7	2	-	-	-	38
Interview	6	6	3	-	-	-	1	16
Observed Behavior	2	2	-	1	-	-	1	6
Closed type Questionnaire	61	44	31	13	2	1	-	152
Card Sort	7	3	4	-	-	-	-	14
None Specified	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
Total	94	71	45	16	2	1	2	231*

*In seven measurements multiple types of testing instruments were used thus making the total higher than the actual number of measurements.

in terms of a prior selection of frameworks by the investigator. It is evident that the majority of investigators have used techniques of the latter sort, often with little discussion of source of frameworks used. In fact, few systematic studies of role content are reported in the literature. Once again, there are no strong relationships between instruments and types of cognition to be seen in Table 2.3 except for a slight indication that open-ended techniques are more likely to be used with norms than expectations.

Sources of Framework. In Table 2.4 the sources of framework reported by investigators are tabulated against type of cognition. In investigating source we attempted to ascertain from whence the investigator obtained the content frameworks which were used in measuring role cognitions. It should be noted that in approximately half of reported measurements content was obtained from respondents (volunteered by respondents, suggested by expert informants, or furnished by the author from observation).

In the other half of reported measurements content frameworks were obtained from the literature or derived from theory. For reasons which are obscure, expectational frameworks seem to have been drawn more heavily from theory or the literature while normative frameworks have been volunteered by respondents or suggested by expert informants. It is possible that investigators have considered norms to be more salient cognitions than expectations or have found it more difficult to phrase open-ended questions in the expectational mode. Altogether, the findings of Table 2.4 suggest that a wide variety of methods has been used by investigators for establishing the contents of empirical role investigations. At least part of this variety is due, however, to an apparent lack of conceptualization of alternate methods by many investigators. As was observed in the previous paragraph, almost no systematic studies of role content are reported in the literature.

TABLE 2.4

SOURCES OF FRAMEWORK VERSUS TYPES OF COGNITION

	Types of Cognition							
Sources	Expectations	Norms	Attributed Expectations	Attributed Norms	Ausvalued Expectations	Ausvalued Norms	Behavior	Totals
Volunteered by Respondents	12	14	12	6	-	-	2	46
Suggested by Expert Informants	12	12	8	1	-	-	2	35
Obtained from Literature	30	24	8	2	-	-	-	64
Derived from Theory	34	10	18	4	-	1	1	68
Furnished By Author from Observation	8	9	5	1	-	-	1	24
None	8	10	2	3	2	-	1	26
Totals	104	79	53	17	2	1	7	263*
Multiply Coded Items	12	10	7	1	-	-	1	

---

* Some authors specified more than one source for frameworks. Such measurements were tabulated under each source mentioned and were also separately tabulated in the bottom line of the table.

TABLE 2.5

BACKGROUND VERSUS TYPE OF COGNITION

Backgrounds | Types of Cognition

	Expectations	Norms	Attributed Expectations	Attributed Norms	Ausvalued Expectations	Ausvalued Norms	Behavior	Totals
Setting	7	2	-	-	-	-	-	10
Social Situation	43	20	17	10	-	1	3	94
Position Set	5	4	3	3	-	-	-	15
Purpose	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
None	46	48	26	5	2	-	3	131
Totals	106	74	46	19	2	1	6	250*

*In seventeen measurements more than one type of background was specified.

Backgrounds Used. Table 2.5 reports the types of background used by investigators in comparison with type of cognition measured. The most outstanding finding in this table is the total lack of backgrounds reported in more than one-half of all reported techniques. Of those backgrounds reported, social situation was by far the most often used. Table 2.5 is perhaps the most striking evidence in the monograph of the immaturity of role theory. In our coding of backgrounds it is possible that the frequently incomplete reporting of methodology used by the investigator led to our not reporting some backgrounds which were actually used. However, if an author even implied background usage he was given the benefit of doubt. It is probable that the majority of investigators are simply unaware of this dimension, although it has obvious effects on both content and cognitive distributions.

Person Usage. Tables 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8 report the categories of subjects, objects, and sentient objects used by the majority of investigators in empirical role studies. In these tables only a limited classification of positions is

TABLE 2.6

CATEGORIES OF SUBJECTS USED TO MEASURE COGNITIONS

	Expectations	Norms	Attributed Expectations	Attributed Norms	Ausvalued Expectations	Ausvalued Norms	Behavior	Total
College Students	33	26	18	4	-	1	4	86
High School Students	5	8	1	1	-	-	-	15
Elementary School Students	6	3	3	1	-	-	-	13
Public School Officials, Supt. and Principal	3	4	3	1	1	1	1	14
Public School Teachers	14	11	10	7	-	1	-	43
College Teachers	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Parents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Married Couples	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	6
People in General, "the community"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Military Positions	7	7	2	-	-	-	1	17
Others	20	11	9	2	1	-	-	43
Total	91	73	47	16	2	3	6	238

TABLE 2.7

CATEGORIES OF OBJECTS USED IN MEASURING COGNITIONS

	Expectations	Norms	Attributed Expectations	Attributed Norms	Ausvalued Norms	Ausvalued Expectations	Behavior	Total
College Students	24	10	15	1	-	-	4	54
High School Students	3	5	-	1	-	-	-	9
Elementary School Students	4	2	2	-	-	-	1	9
Public School officials, supt. and principals	7	4	1	-	-	-	1	13
Public School Teachers	13	14	10	9	2	-	-	48
College Teachers	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	9
Parents	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Married Couples	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	6
People in General, "the community"	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Military Positions	7	7	1	-	-	-	1	16
Others	28	17	12	2	-	-	-	59
Unspecified	-	-	8	2	-	1	-	11
Total	92	69	50	15	2	1	7	236
*Same as Subject	47	21	19	8	1	-	2	98

*These figures indicate the number of cases in which the subject's cognitions about himself were being measured.

TABLE 2.8

CATEGORIES OF SENTIENT OBJECTS USED IN MEASURING SECOND ORDER COGNITIONS

	Attributed Expectations	Attributed Norms	Ausvalued Norms	Ausvalued Expectations	Total
College Students	12	1	-	-	13
High School Students	1	-	-	-	1
Elementary School Students	1	1	-	-	2
Public School officials, supt. and principals	2	2	1	-	5
Public School Teachers	6	4	-	1	11
College Teachers	-	-	-	-	-
Parents	4	2	-	-	6
Married Couples	1	-	-	-	1
People in General, "the community"	9	6	1	-	16
Military Positions	2	-	-	-	2
Others	5	2	-	-	7
None	-	-	-	-	-
Total	43	18	2	1	64 *

*Since sentient objects do not appear in first order cognitions, only second order cognitions were included in this tabulation.

reported including: college students, high school teachers, college teachers, parents, married couples, people in general (or 'the community'), and military positions (such as first sargeant, chaplain, bomber crew member, etc.). All three tables also report an 'others' category in which positions which were reported not more than once or twice were summarized. It should also be noted that in Tables 2.7 and 2.8 an 'unspecified' category is included for those techniques in which investigators were unclear in objects and sentient objects reported. (There were no reported techniques in which subject position was unclear.)

Taken as a group, the dominant focus of these three tables is upon positions defined with respect to the educational system. There are probably two reasons why so many role investigations have taken place in an educational setting: First of all, more energy has been expended on educational research than upon research for any other institution in this country - as attested by the fantastic number of educational journals. Secondly, educational positions are numberous, ubiquitous and pliable. Student and pupil groups are ordinarily 'captive,' while teachers and parents are motivated to participate in educational research. This dominance of empirical studies in the field of education, however, suggests all sorts of biases which result from the unique role relationships of that institution which may not be repeated for other institutions.

It should also be noted in these tables that usage of positions varies strikingly from table to table. For instance, 'the community' appears 16 times as a sentient object, but not at all as a subject or object position. These differences reflect both concerns of the investigators and ease of collecting data. It is far easier to ask college students what 'the community' 'thinks' than it is to obtain a demographic sample of public opinion.

Summary

If we may assume these findings to be representative of the field, numerous short-comings are evident in empirical studies which have been reported in the role area:

1. Little standardization has appeared in the terms, concepts, or techniques used in measurement of role cognitions.
2. A number of investigators have made what appears to be unwarranted assumptions about derived concepts, particularly consensual ones.
3. Few studies have reported complete measurement of role cognitions, while the majority of investigators have used the modal point method.
4. The majority of studies have made use of closed type questionnaires with content areas chosen for respondents. These content areas have been obtained from a variety of sources with little apparent recognition of other possible sources of the implications of source-content relationships
5. Backgrounds have been widely ignored in techniques reported, although social situation has been used in approximately one-third of the studies.
6. Persons involved in subject, object and sentient object have appeared to be chosen for convenience and have predominantly represented positions defined with regard to the educational situation.

In answer to the questions posed at the beginning of the chapter, there is rather less sophistication in empirical studies reported for the role field than was observed in theoretical materials. It has often been observed that much of social science research does not cumulate, that empirical findings are inapplicable to theoretical propositions and that many empirical results are never integrated into the corpus of science. It seems to the authors that these observations will inevitably hold for role research until investigators are willing to adopt methods which reflect the major distinctions of the field. The usage of a common terminology for the field would help solve this problem as would more pressure towards discrimination among journal editors.

THE CODED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barker, Bela O. and Theodore R. Sarbin. "Differential Mediation of Social Adjustment," *Sociometry*, 19 (1956), 69-83.

^{AE}(social perception) $ss_{IV_4}^{CS}$

Psychopathic juvenile delinquent and equal control group non-delinquent
self
2 peers out of test group

^{E}(social perception) $ss_{IV_4}^{CS}$

Psychopatic juvenile delinquents and control group of non-delinquents
Subject himself

2. Bates, A. and J. Cloyd. "Toward the development of operations for defining group norms and member roles," *Sociometry*, 19, (1956), 29-39.

$^{AE^2}$(member roles) $ps_{III_2}^{CQ}$

member of discussion group
other members of group

$^{AE^2}$(member roles) ps_{IV}^{CQ}

member of discussion group
other members of group

$^{AN^1}$(group norms) $ps_{II_2}^{CQ}$

member of discussion group
other members of group

3. Benson, L. G. "Family Social Status and Parental Authority Evaluation Among Adolescents," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XXXVI, (1955), 46-54.

^{E}(evaluation of social status) $ss_{III_4}^{CQ}$

8th and 9th grade girls
self/parents

^{N}(evaluation of social status) $^{ss}III_4^{CQ}$

8th and 9th grade girls
self/parents

^{AE}(evaluation of social status) $^{ss}III_4^{CQ}$

8th and 9th grade girls
self/parents
self/parents

^{AN}(evaluation of social status) $^{ss}III_4^{CQ}$

8th and 9th grade girls
self/parents
self/parents

4. Berkwitz, Leonard. "Group norms among Bomber crews: patterns of perceived crew attitudes, 'actual' crew attitudes, and crew liking related to aircrew effectiveness," Sociometry, 19, (1956), 141-153.

E^1(perceived motivation) II_4^{CQ}

crew members
crew members

N^2(actual motivation) IV_4^{CQ}

crew member
themselves

5. Biddle, Bruce J. An Application of Social Expectation Theory to the Initial Interview, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan; 1955.

E $^{ss}I_3^{CQ}$

student teachers
supervisor of student teachers

student teacher

E^3 $^{ss}I_3^{CQ}$

student teachers
supervisor of student teachers

student teacher

6. Biddle, B. J., Rosencranz, H. A., and Rankin, E. F., Jr. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher, Vol. I, Columbia, University of Missouri Press, (1961).

E $^{ss}V_1^{OQ}$

teacher
teacher

E	$ss_{IV_1}^{OQ}$	teacher teacher
E	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teacher teacher
AE	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teacher teachers people in general
AE	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teachers teachers teachers
AE	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teachers teachers school officials
N	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teacher teachers
AN	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teachers teachers other teachers
AN	$ss_{III_1}^{CO}$	teachers teachers teachers
AN	$ss_{III_1}^{CQ}$	teachers teachers school officials

7. Bidwell, Charles E. "Some effects of administrative behavior: A study in role theory," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, (1957-58), 163-181.

E^2 IV_1^{OQ}

high school teachers
principals and superintendents

E^2 IV_1^{OQ}

high school teacher
superintendents and principals

8. Bidwell, Charles E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, 29, (September, 1955), 41-47.

$E_{(\,-\,)}$ $[ss,st]\,[III]_4^{CQ}$

195 school teachers
superintendent

$E_{(\,-\,)}$ $[ss,st]_{[III]_4^{CQ}}$

195 school teachers
principal

$E_{(\text{perceptions of role behavior})}$ $[ss,st]_{[III]_4^{CQ}}$

195 school teachers
superintendent

$E_{(\text{perceptions of role behavior})}$ $[ss,st]_{[III]_4^{CQ}}$

195 school teachers
principal

9. Bieri, J. "Changes in Interpersonal Perceptions Following Social Interaction," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, (1953), 61-66.

$E_{(\text{perceptions})}$ $[st,ss,ps]_{III_3^{CQ}}$

college students
behavior of his partner

10. Bird, G. E. "Pupil's Estimates of Teachers," Journal of Educational Psychology, 8, (1917), 35-40.

$N_{(\text{estimates})}$ III_3^{OQ}

329 high school students and
50 normal school students
public school teachers

11. Bookbinder, L. J. Self Perception, Social Perception and Response Sets in High and Low Authoritarians, Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, (1959).

E $\quad III_{4}^{CQ}$

96 college students
person in 30 photos

12. Bott, E. "Urban families: Conjugal roles and social networks," Human Relations 8, (1955), 345-384.

$E^{3}_{(Roles)}$ $\quad {}^{ss}IV^{OQ}_{[4]}$

Protestant English persons in London
Husband and wife and family

13. Brownfain, J. J. "Stability of the Self-Concept as a Dimension of Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, (1952), 597-606.

^{E}("private self") $\quad III^{CQ}_{3,5,2}$

62 male college students
themselves

^{AE}("social self") $\quad III^{CQ}_{3,5,2}$

62 male college students
themselves
most other people

14. Burchard, W. W. "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains," American Sociological Review, 19, (1954), 528-535.

$E^{2}_{(role)}$ $\quad {}^{ss}IV^{CQ}_{4}$

36 chaplains and 35 ex-chaplains
soldier

15. Carper, J. W. and Becker, H. S. "Adjustment to conflicting expectations in the development of identification with an occupation," Social Forces, 36, (1957), 51-56.

E
([expectations]) $\quad$ ss $\quad It_{1}$

male graduate students
self, family, occupational peers

16. Champlin, C. D. "Attributes Desired in College Instructors," School and Society, 33, (1931), 89-90.

^{N}(qualities) $^{OQ}_{3}$

150 college students
college instructors

17. Chance, Erika. "Mutual Expectations of Patients and Therapists in Individual Treatment," Human Relations, 10, (1957), 167-178.

E^{2}(expectations and attitudes) $[IV]^{CS}_{S}$

therapist (social workers)
patient

E^{2}(expectations and attitudes) $[IV]^{CS}_{S}$

patient
herself and her therapist

18. Chowdhry, K. and Newcomb, T. M. "The Relative Abilities of Leaders and Non-Leaders to Estimate Opinion of Their Own Group," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, (1952), 51-57.

^{AE}(opinions) $II^{CQ}_{2,4}$

college students in 4 groups

others in group

19. Clinton, R. J. "Qualities College Students Desire in College Instructors," School and Society, 32, (1930), 702.

^{N}(qualities) $^{OQ}_{E}$

177 college juniors
college instructors

20. Cook, L. A., Almack, R. B., and Greenhoe, F. "Teacher and Community Relations," American Sociological Review, 3, (1938), 167-174.

^{AN}(opinions) $[ss,st]III^{CQ}_{1}$

public school teachers
public school teachers
the community

21. Cook, L. A. and Almack, R. B. "The Community Participation of 2,870 Ohio Teachers," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 25 (1930), 107-119.

^{N}(-) IV_{5}^{CQ}

School board members, public school teachers and pupils
public school teachers

22. Corey, S. M. "Attitudes Toward Teaching and Professional Training," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 23, (1937), 521-527.

^{E}(attitudes) IV^{CQ}

college seniors
public school teachers

23. Couch, C. J. *A Study of the Relationships Between Self-Views and Role Taking Accuracy*. Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, (1955).

^{E}(evaluation of self) $^{ss}IV_{2}^{CQ}$

49 pairs of social science students
self

^{AE}(other's evaluation of self) $^{ss}IV_{2}^{CQ}$

49 pairs of social science students
self
opposite partner of 2

24. Couch, C. J. "The Use of the Concept 'Role' and its Derivatives in a Study of Marriage," *Marriage and Family Living*, 20, (1958), 353-357.

^{E}(role obligations) III_{1}^{OQ}

32 married couples
role of husband and wife

^{E}(-) III_{1}^{CQ}

32 married couples
role of husband and wife

^{AE}(role accuracy) III_{1}^{OQ}

32 married couples
role of husband and wife
husband or wife

25. Dalloiio, H. C. "Teachers on Trial: Group of Pupils Tell What They Like in Teachers," Clearing House, 29, (1955), 497-499.

$N_{(\text{opinions and attitudes})}$ $[ss]_{\mathrm{IV}_1^{OQ}}$

200 high school students
public school teachers

26. Davies, J. E. "What are the Traits of the Good Teacher from the Standpoint of Junior High School Pupils?" School and Society, 38, (1933), 649-652.

$N_{(\text{traits})}$ IV_5^{OQ}

72 7th graders
public school teachers

27. Davis, F. J. "Conceptions of official leader roles in the air force," Social Forces, 32, (1954), 253-258.

$N^2_{(\text{role expectations})}$ $ss_{\mathrm{III}_2^{CQ}}$

individual soldier and/or officer
army officers

beh^2 $[ss]_{\mathrm{IV}}^{OB}$

observer
army officer

28. Davis, F. J., Hagedorn, R. and Larson, S. R. "Scaling Problems in a Study of Conceptions of Air Force Leader Roles," Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII, (1954), 279-286.

$N_{(\text{leader role})}$ $ss\ [\mathrm{IV}]_{2,1}^{CQ}$

unspecified number of personnel of 2 AF bases
officers and NCO

29. Davitz, Joel R. "Social Perception and sociometric choice of children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50, (1955), 173-176.

$AE^2_{(\text{perceived similarity})}$ III_4^{CQ}

39 children
one other child
same other child

$E^2_{(\text{social perception})}$ IV_4^{CQ}

39 children
individual himself

30. Dymond, R. F. "A Scale for the Measurement of Empathic Ability" Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14, (1950), 343-350.

$E_{(\ -\ )}$ III_4^{CQ}

53 college students divided into 8 groups
themselves

$E_{(\ -\ )}$ III_4^{CO}

53 college students divided into eight groups
one other person in his group

$AE_{(\text{empathic ability})}$ III_4^{CQ}

53 college students divided into 8 groups
one other individual in his group
the object himself

$AE_{(\text{empathic ability})}$ III_4^{CQ}

53 college students divided into 8 groups
himself
another person in his group

31. Dymond, R. F. "Personality and empathy," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 13, (1949), 127-133.

$E_{(\ -\ )}$ III_4^{CQ}

53 college students divided into 8 groups
themselves

$E_{(\ -\ )}$ III_4^{CQ}

53 college students divided into 8 groups
one other individual in his group

$AE_{(\text{empathic ability})}$ III_4^{CQ}

53 college students divided into 8 groups
one other person in his group
the object himself

^{AE}(empathic ability)	III_4^{CQ}	53 college students divided into 8 groups himself another person in his group

32. Fiedler, F., Warrington, Willard, and Blaisdell, Frances. "Unconscious Attitudes and Sociometric Choice in a Social Group," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 47, (October, 1952), 790-796.

^{E}(attitude)	III_2^{CS}	26 fraternity brothers themselves
^{N}(attitude)	III_2^{CS}	26 fraternity brothers themselves
^{AE}(attitude)	III_2^{CS}	26 fraternity brothers best-liked fellow group members best-liked fellow group members
^{AE}(attitude)	III_2^{CS}	26 fraternity brothers least-liked fellow group members least-liked fellow group members

33. Getzels, J. W. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 29, (September, 1955), 30-40.

AE^{3}(expectations)	st,ss II_1^{CQ}	344 elem. and sec. teachers role of the teacher instructors in their schools
$^{[E]}$(conflict)	st,ss II_1^{CQ}	344 elem. and sec. teachers themselves

34. Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. "Role Conflict and Personality," *Journal of Personality*, 24, (September, 1955), 74-85.

^{E}(role-conflict)	ss III_1^{CQ}	204 officer instructors role of officer instructors

35. Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, XIX, (1954), 164-175.

^{N}(role) $^{ss}\mathrm{III}_{2}^{CQ}$

169 officer instructors AF, 200 officer instructors AF
teacher role in AF

36. Ghiselli, E. E. and Barthol, R. "Role perceptions of successful and unsuccessful supervisors," Journal of Applied Psychology, 40, (1956), 241-244.

E^{2}(self-perceptions) IV_{3}^{CQ}

267 first-line supervisors
themselves

E^{2}(perception) IV_{3}^{CQ}

supervisors of the men
one of the 267 under him

37. Goldberg, A. A. An Experimental Study of the Effects of Evaluation Upon Group Behavior, Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Northwestern University, (1959).

^{E}(evaluation) $^{ss}\mathrm{IV}_{4}^{CQ}$

258 undergraduates
others in group

38. Greenhoe, F. "Community Contacts of Public School Teachers," Elementary School Journal, 40, (1940), 497-506.

^{N}([attitudes]) III_{5}^{CQ}

school board members, lay persons, public school teachers, college students
public school teachers

39. Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1958.

^{N}(expectations) $\mathrm{III}_{5,6}^{IT\ (CQ)}$

pub. school superintendents
role of superintendent

^{PF}(personal characteristics) $\text{III}^{IT\ (CQ)}_{5,6}$

school board members
their school superintendents

^{E}(perceptions) $\text{IV}^{IT\ (CQ)}_{1}$

pub. school superintendents
his community

^{AE}(predicted responses) $\text{IV}^{IT\ (CQ)}_{1}$

superintendents
superintendents
board members

40. Gross, N. and Mason, W. S. "Some Methodological Problems of Eight-Hour Interviews," American Journal of Sociology, LIX, (1953), 197-204.

^{AE}(role expectation) $ss\ \text{III}^{CQ}_{4}$

school superintendents

teachers (pub. school)

^{VE}(role expectations) $ss\ \text{III}^{CQ}_{4}$

school superintendents

teachers in their system

41. Gullahorn, J. T. "Measuring role conflict," American Journal of Sociology, 61,(1955-1956), 299-303.

^{E}(role conflict) $ps,ss\ \text{III}^{CQ}_{4}$

union members and officiers
individual himself

42. Haer, J. "The Public Views the Teacher," Journal of Teacher Education, 4, (1953), 202-4.

^{N}(opinions) III^{CQ}

480 members of community
pub. sch. teachers

43. Haggard, W. W. "Some Freshmen Describe the Desirable College Teacher," School and Society, 58, (1943), 238-240.

^{N}(-) $\text{III}^{CQ}_{3,1}$

college seniors
college teachers

44. Harris, R. P. "Students Reaction to the Education Profession," Educational Administration and Supervision, 32, (1946), 513-520.

$AN^{[3]}$ (reactions)	$[IV]^{CQ}$	college freshmen behavior of public school teachers the community
$VN^{[3]}$ (reactions)	III^{CQ}	college freshmen behavior of public school teachers the community

45. Hall, Robert L. "Predicting Bomber Crew Performance from the Aircraft Commander's Role," Research Report, (February, 1956).

^{E}(role prescriptions)	$III_3^{CQ,IT,OB}$	40 B-29 crews role of aircraft commander
^{N}(attitudes)	$III_3^{CQ,IT,OB}$	40 B-29 crews role of aircraft commander

46. Hall, R. L. Social Influence on the Role Behavior of a Designated Teacher, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1953.

^{N}(attitudinal consensus)	$^{ss}III^{CQ}_{2,3,4}$	45 B-29 crews hypothetical crew situation
^{E}(norm "what if proper")	$^{ss}III^{CQ}_{2,3,4}$	45 B-29 crews aircraft commanders
^{E}(norm "what is proper")	$^{ss}III^{CQ}_{2,3,4}$	45 B-29 crews own crew members

47. Hanlon, T. E. et al. "Congruence of Self and Ideal Self in Relation to Personality Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, (1954), 215-218.

^{E}(self concepts) III^{CS}_{3}

78 male juniors in Catholic high school
themselves

^{N}(ideal self concept) III^{CS}_{3}

78 male juniors in Catholic high school
themselves

48. Hanson, E. M. and Umstaatd, J. G. "Mores and Teacher Selection in Minnesota," School and Society, 45, (1937), 579-582.

AN^{3}(-) $[III]^{CQ}$

pub. school superintendents
pub. school teachers
the community

49. Hartley, Ruth E., and A. Klein. "Sex-Role Concepts Among Elementary School Girls," Marriage and Family Living, 21, (1959), 59-64.

^{E}(role concepts) III^{CS}_{5}

elem. school girls
sex roles

50. Haywood, R. S. "The Child's Report of Psychological Factors in the Family," Archives of Psychology, 28, (July, 1935).

^{AE}(attitudes) $[ss]IV^{CQ}_{3}$

children in grades 4-9
mother and father

^{E}(attitudes) $[ss]IV^{CQ}_{3}$

children in grades 4-9
mother and father

51. Henry, Andrew F. and Borgatta, Edgar F. "A Comparison of Attitudes of Enlisted and Commissioned Air Force Personnel," American Sociological Review, 18, (1953), 669-671.

^{N}(attitudes) $ss,ps\,III^{CQ}$

Air Force commissioned officiers and enlisted personnel
punishment of airmen found guilty of desertion

52. Hilmar, N. A. Conflicting Social Norms in a Formal Organization: A Study of Interpersonal Expectations, Ph.D. Dissertatation, Cornell University, (1955).

^{E}(social norms) $ss_{[IV]}{}^{CQ}_{2,\,[1]}$

soldiers
themselves

^{AE}(interpersonal expectations) $ss_{[IV]}{}^{CQ}_{2,[1]}$

soldiers
self
others in unit

53. Hobart, C. W. "Some Effects of Romanticism During Courtship Upon Marriage Role Opinions," Sociology and Social Research, 42, (1958), 336-343.

^{N}(opinions) $IV^{CQ}_{2,3}$

831 undergraduates
patterns of courtship and marriage

54. Jacobsen, Alver H. "Conflict of Attitudes Toward the Role of the Husband and Wife in Marriage," American Sociological Review, 17, (April, 1952), 146-150

^{E}(attitudes) $[III]^{IT}_{5,2}$

200 married couples, 200 divorced couples
role of husband or wife respectively

55. Johnson, A. H. "The Responses of High School Seniors to a Set of Structured Situations Concerning Teaching as a Career," Journal of Experimental Education. 26, (1958), 263-314.

^{E}(-)

$st,ps,ss_{III}{}^{OQ}_{[3,2]}$

high school seniors
public school teachers

56. Jordan, F. "A Study of Personal and Social Traits in Relation to High School Teaching," The Journal of Educational Sociology, III, (1929), 27-43.

^{E}(personal and social traits) $[st,ss]_{III}{}^{CQ}_{2,3}$

pupils, teachers, supervisors and school patrons
public school teachers

57. Kay, L. W. "The Relation of Personal Frames of Reference to Social Judgments," *Archives of Psychology*, No. 283, (May, 1943).

$N^2_{(social\ norm)}$ III^{CQ}_3

male college students
12 occupations

$N^2_{(social\ norm)}$ III^{CQ}_3

psychology students
43 occupations and suboccupations

58. Kay, W. L. "Variations in Role and Group Identification," *Journal of Social Psychology*. 27-28, (November, 1946), 63-79.

$E_{(-)}$ $III^{OQ}_{[3]}$

102 college students
themselves

$N_{(opinions)}$ $III^{CQ}_{[3]}$

258 different college students
themselves

59. Keighhin, M. A. "Thornburn Teachers Rated on Their Own Terms," *Clearing House*, 23, (1948), 82-83.

$N_{(-)}$ III^{OQ}_1

high school teachers
high school teachers in their school system

60. Koopman, M. O. "What One Midwest Community Expects of its Teachers," *Educational Research Bulletin*, 25, (1946), 34-31.

$N_{([expectations])}$ $III^{CQ}_{3,5,1}$

270 adult members of a community
pub. sch. teachers

61. Lamson, E. F. "Some College Students Describe the Desirable College Teacher," *School and Society*, 56, (1942), 615.

$N_{(-)}$ $^{ss}III^{CQ}_1$

senior college students
college teachers

62. Lichliter, M. "Social Obligations and Restrictions Placed on Women Teachers," School Review, 54, (1946), 14-23.

$^{\text{AN}}$(attitudes) $[\text{ps,ss}]_{\text{III}}^{\text{CQ}}$

women pub. sch. teachers
behavior of women pub. sch. teachers
community and school board members

63. Lieberman, S. The Relationship Between Attitudes and Roles: A Natural Field Experiment. PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, (1954).

$^{\text{E}}$(norms and expectations) III_2

139 workers
self, foreman, steward, workers, management seniors

64. Livingood, F. G. "Educational Research and Statistics--Estimates of High School Seniors," School and Society, 41, (1935), 550-552.

$^{\text{N}}$([opinions]) $\text{III}_{[2]}^{\text{CQ}}$

high school seniors
high school teachers

65. McGill, K. H. "The School Teacher Stereotype," Journal of Educational Sociology, 4, (1931), 642-650.

$^{\text{E}}$(stereotypes) IV^{OQ}

college students
pub. sch. teachers

66. McKenna, Sister Helen V. et. al. "The Concepts of the Ideal Self and the Friend," Journal of Personality, 24 (March, 1956), 262-271.

$^{\text{E}}$(self concept) III_3^{CS}

90 female college students
themselves

$^{\text{N}}$(ideal self concept) III_3^{CS}

90 female college students
ideal self concept

$^{\text{AE}}$(concepts) III_3^{CS}

90 female college students
best friend
same best friend

67. MacDonald, Marion E. "Students' Opinions as Regards Desirable and Undesirable Qualifications and Practices of Their Teachers in Teacher Training Institutions," Educational Administration and Supervision, 17, (1931), 139-146.

^{N}(opinions) IV^{OQ}

college students
college instructors

68. Manwiller, L. V. "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 26, (1958), 315-54.

^{AE}(expectations) $\mathrm{III,IV}^{CQ}_{5,3}$

pub. sch. teachers and board members
community

69. Martire, John G. "Relationships Between the Self Concept and Differences in the Strength and Generality of Achievement Motivation," Journal of Personality, 24, (1956), 364-375.

^{N}(self-Ideal) $[ss]_{\mathrm{III}^{CQ}_{3}}$

53 college students
themselves

^{E}(self concept) $[ss]_{\mathrm{III}_{3}}$

53 college students
themselves

70. Martire, John G. and Hornberger, Robt. H. "Self Congruence by Sex and Between the Sexes, in a 'Normal' Population," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 13, (1957), 288-291.

$N^{[3]}$(self-Ideal) $[ss]_{\mathrm{III}^{CQ}_{3,4}}$

80 undergrads
importance of traits

^{E}(actual self) $[ss]_{\mathrm{III}^{CQ}_{3,4}}$

80 undergrads
themselves

AN^{3}(social self) $[ss]_{\mathrm{III}^{CQ}_{3,4}}$

80 undergrads
traits of people
most people

71. Mayo, George D. and J. R. Kinzer. "A Comparison of the 'Racial' Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in 1940 and 1948," The Journal of Psychology, 29, Second Half, (April, 1950), 397-405.

^{N}(attitudes) $\text{st,ps,ss}_{\text{III}_{5,2}^{CQ}}$

460 white and 467 Negroes
Negroes in general

^{N}(attitudes) $\text{st,ps,ss}_{\text{III}_{5,2}^{CQ}}$

456 whites, 626 Negroes
Negroes in general

72. Miyamoto, S. F. and Dornbusch, S. F. "A Test of Interactionist Hypotheses of Self-perception," American Journal of Sociology, 61, (1956) 399-403.

E^{2}(self conception) III_{4}^{CQ}

195 college students
self

E^{2}(self conception) III_{4}^{CQ}

195 college students
others in 10 group sections

AE^{2}(perceived response) III_{4}^{CQ}

195 college students
other members of 10 group sections

AE^{1}(the generalized other) III_{4}^{CQ}

195 college students
themselves
most people

73. Monk, M., and Newcomb, T. W. "Perceived Consensus Within and Among Occupational Classes," American Sociological Review, XXI, (February, 1956), 71-79.

^{AE}(perceived consensus) $\text{ss}_{\text{IV}_{4}^{CQ}}$

unspecified number of residents of Detroit, Mich.
three best friends and occupational groups
same as object

74. Motz, Anabelle Bender. "The Role Conception Inventory: A Tool for Research in Social Psychology," American Sociological Review, 17, (August, 1952), 465-471.

^{N}(value judgments of role conceptions) IV_{2}^{CQ}

674 married students
roles of husband and wife

75. Olmstead, M. S. "Character and Social Role," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII, (July, 1957), 49-57.

^{E}(social role) III_{4}^{CQ}

190 women students in college
self, other students, parents

76. Olmstead, M. S. "Orientation and Role in the Small Group," American Sociological Review, XIX, (1954) 741-751.

E^{1}(role orientation) $^{ss}[IV]_{4}^{OB}$

24 four man groups
selves

AE^{1}(role orientation) $^{ss}[IV]_{4}^{OB}$

24 four man groups
selves
others in group

N^{1}(role orientation) $^{ss}[IV]_{4}^{OB}$

24 four man groups
selves

AN^{1}(role orientation) $^{ss}[IV]_{4}^{OB}$

24 four man groups
selves
others in group

77. Ort, R. B. "A Study of role conflicts as related to class level," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, (1952), 425-432.

^{N}(role expectation) IV_{3}^{IT}

100 white male adolescents
"a boy"

78. Ort, R. B. "A study of role conflicts as related to happiness in marriage," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 45, (1950), 691-699.

E^{1}(role expectations) $^{ss}IV_{3,4}^{CQ}$

50 married students and 50 students' wives
50 married students and 50 students' wives

79. Pendleton, P. W. The Academic Role of the College Student, PhD Dissertation, Ohio State, (1955).

E(role) $^{ss}IV_{2}^{CQ}$

college student and parents
student role

80. Phillips, B. N. "Community Control of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Teacher Education, 6, (1955), 293-300.

AN(opinions) $[ps, ss]\,IV_{5}^{CQ}$

high school students
pub. sch. teachers
community

81. Rasmussen, G. and Zander, A. "Group Membership and Self-Evaluation," Human Relations, 7, (1954), 239-252.

AE^{3}(opinion) III_{4}^{CQ}

85 public school teachers
role of public school teachers
members of his sub-group of teachers

AE^{3}(opinion) III_{4}^{CQ}

85 public school teachers
role of public school teachers
members of other group

E(opinions) III_{4}^{CQ}

85 public school teachers
my position as a teacher

AN^{3}(attitude) III_{4}^{CQ}

85 public school teachers
role of teacher
other teachers

$\text{N}_{(\text{attitude})}$ III_4^{CQ}

85 public school teachers
his own ideal level of performance

82. Reeder, L., Donohue, G. A. and Biblarz, A. "Conceptions of Self and Others," American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, (Sept. 1960), 153-159.

$\text{AE}_{(\text{perceived ratings})}$ $^{ss}\text{III}^{OQ}$

54 AF crew members
other crew members

83. Reissman, Leonard. "A study of role conceptions in a bureaucracy," Social Forces, 27:305.

$\text{E}^2_{(\text{role conceptions})}$ $^{ss}\text{IV}_3^{CQ}$

263 bureaucrats
role of bureaucrats

84. Robbins, F. G. "Student Reaction to Teacher Personality Traits," Educational Administration and Supervision, 30 (1944), 241-246.

$\text{N}_{(\text{personality traits})}$ III_1^{CQ}

350 soph. and jr. college students in education
college instructors

85. Rogers, Dorothy. "A Study of the Reactions of Forty Men to Teaching in the Elementary School," Journal of Educational Sociology, 27, (1953), 24-35.

$\text{E}_{(\ -\ )}$ $\text{IV}^{CQ,OQ}$

male elementary teachers
role of male public school teachers

$\text{N}_{(\ -\ )}$ $\text{IV}^{CQ,OQ}$

male elementary teachers
role of male public school teachers

$\text{AE}_{(\ -\ )}$ $\text{IV}^{CQ,OQ}$

male elementary teachers
role of male public school teachers
"people," "the community"

86. Rogers, Dorothy. "Implications of Views Concerning the Typical School Teacher," Journal of Educational Sociology, 23, (1950), 482-487.

$^{AE}($ - $)$ III^{CQ}_{1}

Elem. sch. teachers and college students
"typical" school teacher
community

87. Rommetveit, R. Social Norms and Roles, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, (1955).

^{AE}(received social norms) $^{ss}IV^{OQ}_{1}$

57 Norwegian students
self
mother and teacher

^{AN}(received social norms) $^{ss}IV^{OQ}_{1}$

20 students
self
mother and father

^{AE}(received social norms) $^{ss}IV^{OQ}_{1}$

students
self
fellow students

^{AE}(received social norms) $^{ss}IV^{OQ}_{1}$

students
self
ministers

88. Rosencranz, H. W. The Relation of Social References in Imagery of Occupational Life Styles, PhD Dissertation, Michigan State University, (1960).

^{E}(impressions of way of life) $^{ss}III^{OQ}_{3,4}$

1,045 fresh. and soph. in basic social science
designated and described occupation

89. Runkel, P. J. et. al. "Summer Guidance Institute Follow-Up Study," Mimeographed, University of Illinois, (February, 1961).

^{E} $^{ss}IV^{CQ}_{5}$

Faculties of 28 schools
a counselor

$N_{(\text{desirable or appropriate})}$ $ss_{IV_5^{CQ}}$

Faculties of 28 schools
a counselor

90. Seeman, Melvin. "Role Conflict and Ambivalence in Leadership," American Sociological Review, 18, (August, 1953), 373-380.

$N^2_{(\text{role})}$ IV_3^{CQ}

high school teachers
superintendent

$N^2_{(\text{role})}$ IV_3^{CQ}

teachers and leaders
superintendents and principals
superintendent

91. Rose, Arnold M. "The Adequacy of Women's Expectations for Adult Roles," Social Forces, 30, (1951), 69-77.

E III^{CQ}

256 college students
adult roles

92. Seidman, J. M. and Knapp, L. B. "Teacher Likes and Dislikes of Student Behavior and Student Perceptions of These Attitudes," Journal of Educational Research, 47, (1953), 143-149.

$N_{(\text{attitudes})}$ IV_1^{OQ}

high school teachers
behavior of students

$AN_{(\text{perceptions})}$ IV_1^{OQ}

high school students
behavior of high school students
high school teachers

93. Sharpe, R. F. Differences Between Perceived Administrative Behavior and Role-Norms as Factors in Leadership Evaluation and Group Morale. PhD Dissertation, Standford University, (1954).

$E_{(\text{ideal configuration})}$ $ss_{III_{1,3}^{CQ}}$
or
(Role-norms) $ss_{IV_{1,3}^{CQ}}$

211 teachers, 13 principals,
11 supt. office
self, principal, supt.

94. Sherif, M., White, B. Jack, and Harvey, O. J. "Status in Experimentally Produced Groups," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX, (January, 1955), 370-379.

E $\quad {}^{ss}III_{4}$

12 yr. old boys at summer camp
self

E $\quad {}^{ss}III_{4}$

12 yr. old boys at summer camp
friend's behavior

95. Sherwood, Rae. "The Bantu Clerk: A Study of Role Expectations," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, (1958), 285-316.

$N^{1}_{\text{(role expectations)}} \quad III^{OQ}_{4}$

Bantu clerks and their white superiors
role of the efficient Bantu clerk

96. Smith, A. A. "What is Good College Teaching?" *Journal of Higher Education*, 15, (1944), 216-218.

$N_{\text{(traits)}} \quad {}^{ss}III^{OQ}_{1}$

college students
college instructors

97. Smith, Mapheus. "An Empirical Scale of Prestige Status of Occupations," *American Sociological Review*, 8, (April, 1943), 185-192.

$E_{\text{(prestige status)}} \quad III^{CQ}_{3}$

345 high school students and college undergraduates
100 occupations

98. Sommer, Robert and Killian, M. Lewis. "Areas of Value Differences: I. A Method for Investigation," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, (1954), 227-235.

$E_{\text{(stereotype)}} \quad III^{CQ}_{3}$

240 white female undergrads
behavior of a "Negro"

$E_{\text{(stereotype)}} \quad III^{CQ}_{3}$

250 white female undergrads
behavior of "a person"

^{N}(approved role)	III_3^{CQ}	250 white female undergrads behavior of "a Negro"
^{N}(approved role)	III_3^{CQ}	250 white female undergrads behavior of "a person"

99. Sommer, Robert, and Killian, Lewis M. "Areas of Value Difference: II. Negro-White Relations," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, (1954), 237-244.

^{E}(stereotype)	III_3^{CQ}	100 female Negro undergrads behavior of "a Negro"
^{N}(approved role)	III_3^{CQ}	100 female Negro undergrads behavior of "a Negro"

100. Steiner, Ivan D. and Dodge, Joan S. "A Comparison of Two Techniques Employed in the Study of Interpersonal Perception," *Sociometry*, 20, (March, 1957), 1-7.

^{E}(self ratings)	III_3^{CQ}	60 female college students themselves
^{N}(-)	III_3^{CQ}	60 female college students partner
^{AE}(-)	III_3^{CQ}	60 female college students partner's rating of herself partner

101. Stock, Dorothy. "Investigations into the Interrelations Between the Self Concept and Feelings Directed Toward other Persons and Groups," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 13, (June, 1949), 176-180.

^{E}(self concept) III_3^{IT}

10 cases from counseling center
themselves

^{AE}(-) III_3^{IT}

10 cases from counseling center
themselves
other people

102. Stouffer, S. A. "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," *American Sociological Review*, XIV, (December, 1949), 707-17.

^{E}(norms, social norms, role expectations) I_6^{CQ}

college students (196)
self

^{AE}(norms, social norms, role expectations) I_6^{CQ}

196 college students
university authorities, friends

103. Stouffer, Samuel A. and Toby, Jackson. "Role Conflict and Personality," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVI, (March, 1951), 395-406.

^{N}(particularistic obligations)^{ps,ss} III_4^{CQ}

648 undergrad students
self
specifies there is no audience

^{E}(particularistic obligations)^{ps,ss} IV_4^{CQ}

648 undergrad students
self

104. Strong, Samuel M. "Social Types in a Minority Group--Formulation of Method," *American Journal of Sociology*, 48, (March, 1943), 563-573.

^{E}(social types) $III_{5,3}^{CQ}$

77 members of Negro community in Chicago
a particular social type

^{AE}(social types) $III^{CQ}_{5,3}$

77 members of Negro community in Chicago
a particular social type
the community

^{AE}(social types) $III^{CQ}_{5,3}$

77 members of Negro community in Chicago
a particular social type
"Whites"

^{N}(social types) $IV^{CQ}_{5,3}$

77 members of Negro community in Chicago
a particular social type

105. Stryker, S. "Role-taking Accuracy and Adjustment," Sociometry, XX, (December, 1957), 286-296.

^{E}(attitudes) IV^{CQ}_{2}

46 family units
self

^{AE}(ascribed or predicted attitudes) IV^{CQ}_{2}

46 family units
parents-in-law
parents-in-law

106. Story, M. L. "Public Attitude is Changing Toward the Teacher's Personal Freedom," Nations Schools, 45, (1950), 69-70.

^{VN}(opinions) IV^{CQ}

pub. school teachers
behavior of pub. school teachers
pub. school administrators

^{N}(opinions) IV^{CQ}

pub. school teachers
behavior of pub. school teachers
pub. school administrators

107. Terrien, Frederic W. "The Occupational Roles of Teachers," Journal of Educational Sociology, 29, (1955-1956), 14-20.

^{AE}(conceptions about expectations)	$III^{IT}_{5,6}$	pub. school teachers role of pub. school teachers community

108. Terrien, F. "Who Thinks What About Educators?" American Journal of Sociology, 59, (1953), 150-158.

^{E}(attitudes)	IV^{CQ}	lay public pub. sch. teachers
^{N}(attitudes)	IV^{CQ}	lay public public sch. teachers

109. Thomas, E. J. "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size," American Sociological Review, 24, (1959), 30-37.

$^{E^2}$(role consensus)	III^{CQ}	109 pub. assistance workers and their supervisors role of pub. assistance workers
$^{E^2}$(breadth of role conception)	III^{CQ}	workers only self
^{N}(ethical commitment)	$^{ss}IV^{CQ}_{2}$	workers only self

110. Tiedman, S. C. "A Study of Pupil-Teacher Relationships," Journal of Educational Research, 35, (1942), 657-664.

^{N}(opinion, attitudes, and feelings)	IV^{CQ}	Jr. high school pupils pub. school teacher behavior

111. Toby, J. "Some variables in Role Conflict Analysis," Social Forces, 30, (1951-1952), 323-327.

$^{E}{}_{(role)}$ $ss_{IV_5}^{OQ}$

Harvard undergraduates
individual student himself

112. Trabue, M. R. "Judgments by 820 College Executives of Traits Desirable in Lower Division College Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 21 (1953), 337-341.

$^{N}{}_{(judgments)}$ III^{CQ}

college executives
college instructors

113. Turner, R. "Moral Judgment: a Study in Roles," American Sociological Review, 17, (1952), 70-77.

$^{E}{}_{(role\ conceptions)}$ $ss_{IV_4}^{OQ}$

120 college students
self

114. Turner, R. "Self and Other in Moral Judgment," American Sociological Review, 19, (1954), 249-259.

$^{E^2}{}_{(roles,\ or\ expectation)}$ $ss_{IV_4}^{OQ}$

120 Jr. Sr. college students
self

$^{AE^2}{}_{(roles,\ or\ expectations)}$ $ss_{IV_4}^{OQ}$

120 Jr. Sr. college students

parents, friends, organization

115. Videbeck, R. "Self-Conception of the Reactions of Others," Sociometry, XXIII, (December, 1960), 351-359.

$^{E}{}_{(self\text{-}conception)}$ $ss_{III_4}^{CQ}$

30 superior speech subjects
self

$^{beh}{}_{(self\text{-}conception)}$ $ss_{III_2}^{CQ}$

30 college speech students
self

other students

116. Videbeck, Richard and Bates, A. P. "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," Sociometry, 22, (1959), 1-11.

$^{\text{N}}{}_{\text{(role expectations)}}$	III_1^{CQ}	groups of college students self
$^{\text{N}}{}_{\text{(role expectations)}}$	III_1^{CQ}	groups of college students self other members of group
$^{\text{beh}}{}_{\text{(role expectations)}}$	III_1^{CQ}	groups of college students the group
$^{\text{beh}}{}_{\text{(role expectations)}}$	III_1^{CQ}	groups of college students individual student in the group

117. Wallin, P. "Cultural contradictions and sex roles: a Report Study," American Sociological Review, 15, (1950), 288-293.

$^{\text{N}}{}_{\text{(role)}}$	$\text{ss}_{\text{IV}}^{\text{IT}}{}_{[2]}$	163 women college students unmarried self
$^{\text{beh}}{}_{\text{(role)}}$	$\text{ss}_{\text{III}}^{\text{CQ}}{}_{[2]}$	163 women college students unmarried self

118. Walters, James and Ojemann, Ralph H. "A Study of the Components of Adolescent Attitudes Concerning the Role of Women," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXV, (1952), 101-110.

$^{\text{E}}{}_{\text{(attitudes)}}$	$\text{ss}_{\text{IV}}^{\text{IT,CQ,OQ}}{}_{[3]}$	Sophomore and seniors in high school self

$N_{(\text{attitudes of "should"})}$ $ss_{IV_{3}}^{IT,CQ,OQ}$

Sophs. and Seniors in HS
self

-

119. Whitelow, C. M. "Attitudes and Behaviors of High School Students," *American Journal of Sociology*, XL, (1940), 489-494.

$N_{(\text{expectation})}$ III

high school students
self

$E_{(\text{behavior})}$ II

high school students
self

120. Winslow, C. N. "A Study of the Extent of Agreement Among Friends' Opinions and their Ability to Estimate the Opinions of Each Other," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 8, (1937), 433-442.

$N^{2}_{(\text{opinions})}$ III^{CQ}_{3}

college students
themselves

$AN^{2}_{(\text{opinions})}$ III^{CQ}_{3}

college students

other students

121. Wispe, L. G. "A Sociometric Analysis of Conflicting Role-Expectancies," *American Journal of Sociology*, 61, (1955), 134-137.

$E^{2}_{(\text{role expectations})}$ $III^{CQ}_{[3]}$

43 insurance salesmen
other agents, managers, and assistant managers

122. Wispe, L. G. and Lloyd, K. E. "Some Situational and Psychological Determinants of the Desire for Structural Interpersonal Relationships," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LI, (1955), 57-60.

$N^{2}_{(\text{formalized social relationships})}$ IV^{IT}_{1}

43 insurance agents
managers and assistant managers

123. Yourglich, A. "Study on Correlations Between College Teachers' and Students' Concepts of 'Ideal Student' and 'Ideal Teacher'," Journal of Educational Research, 49, (1955), 59-64.

$N_{\text{(ideal traits)}}$

III_{6}^{OQ}

college students and college instructors

college instructors

CHAPTER III

PROPOSITIONAL STRUCTURE IN ROLE THEORY

Introduction

Ten years ago Neiman and Hughes (1951) wrote that "Hypotheses involving the concept role are extremely rare in the literature." Is this still true today, or are we gradually assembling a body of suggested and tested hypotheses which will lead towards the desired integration of the field?

In order to answer this question the authors have reviewed over 300 references selected from the bibliography which were presumed to make theoretical contributions to role theory. Of these materials, 39 references were found to state propositions for role theory in a sufficiently straight forward manner that we were able to rewrite them in common English and afterwards in a coding system devised for the purpose. Altogether, 133 propositions were discovered and coded in these references. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the concerns and coverage of these propositions and to assess the propositional structure of role theory circa 1961.

Methods

General Criteria. The primary consideration in including or excluding references coded for this chapter was, of course, whether the author of the reference stated propositions which could be translated into the system of concepts outlined in this monograph. In practice this meant that a form of role terminology had to be used and that clear propositions had to be stated. Unfortunately, many 'theoretical' contributions to the role literature do not state clear propositions involving role concepts. Such references are often concerned with definitions, denotations or connotations of terms, insightful discussions of a particular role, categorical classifications, disputations with the discussions of others, or defense of the role orientation as opposed to competing systems. With reluctance we decided to code only references exhibiting explicit propositions.

There were a number of criteria which appeared to be related to clarity of propositional statement. Most useful propositions appeared in the form of 'Variable X implies variable Y' thus denoting both an independent and dependent variable. A few existential propositions were also included if they were clear statements of a theoretical position and not merely the *post hoc* reports of empirical investigation. On the other hand, most 'functional' propositions - were uncodable due to their teleological confusion or categorical nature. A few references also exhibited statements that were called propositions, and which on first glance looked like propositions, but which upon closer examination were so hedged with alternatives that parsimonious coding was impossible. Much apparently insightful discussion is thus not represented in the findings of this chapter because it appeared in the form of 'maybe A but maybe B' or 'on the other hand.'

Codes for Simple Variables. In reviewing references for this paper, ten basic variables were coded using three coding-schemata. In addition, several variables derived from the basic elements were also coded.

In each code the main variable was identified and several necessary or possible items of information relating to the main variable were indicated inside brackets. For instance, the code for a behavior read:

Beh [0 ; T ; content of behavior ; background ; A ; method].*

The term outside the brackets, *behavior* (Beh), identifies the main variable under consideration. Within the brackets is one item that must necessarily be specified--the object (0)--and several more that may or may not be specified by the author. The target (T) of the behavior is an obvious possibility, as is the content of the behavior, the background in which the action takes place, and the audience (A) that can witness the behavior.

---

*Abbreviations used are from Chapter I.

For any dimension not specified by an author, a dash (-) was inserted in that slot. Otherwise, the information for a dimension was written in using abbreviations given above, plain English, and certain symbols explained below. If the author made important specifications that were not covered by the coding arrangement, a note was added.

In this code and all others, the slot at the end ('method') was filled in if the proposition was tested empirically, specifying the instrument or method of observation employed in tapping the variable under consideration.

The other two basic-elements codes were used for simple first-order cognitions and second-order cognitions. In both, the type of cognition under consideration was indicated outside of the brackets, and several relevant dimensions had places within the brackets, separated by semi-colons.

These codes read:

E (N, or C) [S ; O ; T ; content ; background ; A ; method].

AE (or VE, AN, VN, AC, VC) [S ; S-O ; O ; T ; content ; background ; A ; method].

These codes were the same as the code for behavior (beh) except for the addition of the subject (S) and sentient-object (S-O) slots, and for the main variable specification.

Operators. Thus far, the basic elements, or operants, of the system have been given. A list of operators, or symbols, were used to show relationships between the elements. These included:

1. Implication: $\Rightarrow$

A $\Rightarrow$ B reads "A implies B;"

A $\not\Rightarrow$ B reads "A does not imply B."

In a statement of implication, a + or - was placed over the part of the statement that varies, in case some increase or decrease was dealt with.

2. Greater than-less than: $>$, $<$

   $A > B$ reads "A is greater than B;"

   $A < B$ reads "A is less than B."

3. Similarity:

   $A \approx B$ means "A is similar to B," or "A is in a similarity relationship with B."

   $A \not\approx B$ means "A is not similar to B."

4. Definition: $\equiv$

   $A \equiv B$ means "A is identically equal to B."

   $A \not\equiv B$ means "A is not identically equal to B."

5. Inclusion: $\subset$, $\supset$

   The entity next to the open end of the sign was included in that on the other side of the sign.

   $A \subset B$ means "A includes B."

   $A \supset B$ means "A is included in B."

   Non-inclusion was indicated by a slash through the inclusion sign.

Codes for Constructed Variables

1. *Conformity and Veridicality*. Two theoretical definitions coded through the use of concepts were *conformity* (con) and *veridicality* (ver). The definitions of both relate cognitions and behavior, but in different ways. In symbolic form, the definitions are:

1. a. First order conformity (Con_2) $\equiv$ E or N $\Rightarrow \approx$ Beh.

1. b. Second order conformity (Con_2) $\equiv$ AE (or VE, AN, VN) $\Rightarrow \not\approx$ Beh.

2. Veridicality $\equiv$ Beh. $\Rightarrow \not\approx$ cognition (E, N, AE, AN, VE, VN)

Conformity is defined as a relationship between some cognition and behavior such that the cognition implies a similar behavior, or, in other terms, the behavior follows the cognition. For example, one may speak of the conformity of the behavior of graduate students in regard to number of hours they study per week with the norms held by the faculty for how many hours graduate students should study per week--first order conformity (Con_1). Or, conformity of the studying behavior of graduate students to the norms that graduate students attribute to the faculty about their studying behavior--second order conformity (Con_2).

Veridicality is similar to conformity, except for the reversal of logical construction. Whereas in the case of conformity an expectation or norm implies a similar behavior; in the case of veridicality, the behavior implies a similar cognition. In other words, veridicality indicates the degree to which a cognition correctly reveals some real world event.

Codes for variables based upon these three definitions may be given:

Con_1 [type of 1st-order cognition ; S ; O ; T ; content ;
background ; A ; method].

Con_2 [type of 2nd-order cognition ; S ; S-O ; O ; T ;
content ; background ; A ; method].

Ver [content ; type of cognition ; S ; O ; T ; background ;
A ; method].

2. Accuracy. The term 'veridicality' in the literature is used for at least two notions. One is the behavior-cognition relationship, as above. A second usage has to do with how closely a second-order cognition correctly reveals a first-order cognition. To distinguish the two, the second may be labelled accuracy.

Accuracy (Acc) $\equiv$ 1st-order cognition $\Rightarrow \approx$ 2nd-order cognition.

A comparison between the norms attributed by parents to school officials for the behavior of teachers and the norms actually held by the school officials, for example, would involve a statement of accuracy.

Accuracy has the potential for being an important concept, though it has not been so perseverated on in the literature as other concepts such as conformity$_1$. Cognitions attributed by social actors to certain other individuals and groups may have considerable importance for their own cognitions and behavior. Interesting problems arise if the degree of accuracy is low. It would seem that accuracy might well be considered in any sophisticated social analysis; it may have special relevance for the study of social disorganization.

Accuracy was coded as a variable as follows:

Acc [type of 1st-order cognition ; type of 2nd-order cognition;
S ; S-O ; O ; T ; content ; background ; A ; method].

3. Optimism. Another concept dealing with a comparison between two types of cognitions is optimism. The cognitions in this case are limited to the 1st-order level, and the comparison is always between expectations and norms. The subject for optimism is always either a single person, or a single collectivity.

Optimism (Opt) = E of a subject $\approx$ N of a subject.

The question in optimism is most simply stated: To what extent do people expect the same things to happen as they want to happen?

As a variable, optimism was coded:

Opt [S ; O ; T ; content ; background ; A ; method].

4. Uniformity. Just as veridicality and accuracy are sometimes not distinguished, the term 'conformity' is used to apply both to conformity as defined above and to what might be called behavioral uniformity.

Behavioral uniformity (Uni$_1$) = beh of $O_1 \approx$ beh of O_2.

Uniformity thus refers to the similarity of the behavior of two (or more) objects or object-collectivities. It is assumed that the assessment of uniformity would use cases with similar targets and similar situations, and so on.

This comparison involves no consideration of cognitions--what others expect or want the actors to do, what the actors think others expect of them, or even what the actors think they are doing. Uniformity refers simply to the comparison of two or more objects in regard to one kind of behavior.

It is possible,however, to define behavioral uniformity on a cognitive level. In this case, uniformity is a cognition about the behavioral uniformity of at least two objects. For example, a dean of students may hold a cognition about the degree of behavioral uniformity between two fraternities in regard to amount of drinking behavior. Uniformity in this sense differs from a simple expectation in that it involves comparison. Uniformity on this level was called 'cognized behavioral uniformity'(Uni$_2$).

Variables for these two concepts are coded as:

Behavioral uniformity (Uni$_1$) [O_1 ; O_2 ; T ; content ; background ; a ; method].

Cognized behavioral uniformity (Uni$_2$)[S ; O_1 ; O_2 ; T ; content ; background ; A ; method].

5. Sanction. The most general definition of 'sanction' is:

$$\text{Sanction} \equiv \overset{+}{\text{conformity}} \Rightarrow \overset{+}{\text{rewarding}} \text{ or } \overset{-}{\text{punishing}} \text{ behavior.}$$

A sanctioning behavior is directed toward an object (who may or may not be conforming in his behavior) and the person who directs this behavior is a subject who holds a cognition that is more or less conformed to. In other words, sanction may be defined as behavior directed toward a person so as to reward conformity and punish nonconformity. This definition was indicated by the term sanction$_1$.

Sanctioning, defined thus, involves a two-phase sequence. In the first, an object (X) more or less conforms to a cognition for X's behavior held by subject (Y). In the second, the subject (Y) becomes an object and exhibits rewarding or punishing behavior toward person X, who is now not an object but a target.

The code for the sanction (Snc) variable is in two parts. The first part refers to the actual rewarding or punishing behavior. The second refers to the situation that led up to the sanction and is a first-order cognition code without the subject and object slots. The subject slot is omitted because of redundancy with the first object slot; and the object slot is omitted because of redundancy with the first target slot. In other words, the subject holding cognitions more or less conformed to is the same person as the object who exhibits the sanctioning behavior; and the object who more or less conforms is the target of the sanctioning behavior.

> Scn [O who exhibits sanctioning behavior (i.e., subject holding cognitions more or less conformed to) ; T who receives sanctioning behavior (i.e., O who more or less conforms) ; content of the sanctioning behavior ; background ; A ; T of the behavior leading to the sanction ; content of the behavior leading to the sanction ; background ; A ; method].

Another variety of sanction may also be distinguished, on the cognitive level. In this definition the sanction is an expectation held by a subject that others will act so as to reward conformity and punish nonconformity. This variety will be referred to as 'identified sanction.'

The code for the identified sanction (IdnSnc) variable amounts to two modified 1st-order cognition codes placed end to end. The first part refers to the expectation for the sanctioning behavior. The second part refers to the cognized behavior leading to the sanction. As for a simple sanction, the subject and object slots are omitted from the second part of the code:

> IndSnc [S who expects the sanction ; O who is expected to exhibit the sanctioning behavior (i.e., S whose cognitions are more or less conformed to) ; T of the sanctioning behavior (i.e. O who is cognized as more or less conforming) ; content of the sanctioning behavior ; background ; A ; T of the behavior expected to be sanctioned ; content of behavior expected to be sanctioned ; background ; A ; method].

IdnSnc may refer to a period of time after the events described in the second part of the code have already occurred (that is, the more or less conforming behavior), or the expectation for the sanctioning behavior might deal with possibilities of reward or punishment occuring. In the first case, person X might have violated some norm held by person Y (or even attributed to person Y) and is anticipating some punishment or otherwise non-reinforcing behavior. This situation occurs in Hemingway's "The Killers." In the second case, the expectation would be of a 'what if I did so-and-so' sort.

It is not necessary, in the case of IdnSnc, that the subject who is expecting the sanction be the cognized (or actual) object exhibiting the behavior leading to the expected sanction. Any person may expect that a basketball player will be cheered by the crowd and patted on the back by his coach if he sinks the decisive short in a basketball game (or barred by the NCAA if he takes bribes)--whether or not this person is the basketball player, and whether or not he holds cognitions for the basketball player about game-winning or bribe-taking *per se*.

The concept sanction differs from the previous constructed concepts--first order conformity, second order conformity, behavioral uniformity, cognized behavioral uniformity, optimism, veridicality, and accuracy--in that it has nothing to do with comparison. In all seven of the other concepts, some comparison between cognitions, or between behavior and cognitions, is referred to. The symbolic definition of sanction does not use a similarity sign ($\approx$), on the other hand. Thus, sanction is not a variable in the same sense that the others are.

6. Pluralities. In most of the variables discussed so far, the question of pluralities of people has been slighted. Most of the concepts have been defined in terms of the actions or the cognitions of people in sets of unstipulated size, from one (or even zero) to many. For sets greater than one, it may be unclear whether one is dealing with central tendencies of characteristics and cognitions, or if each member of a collectivity is assumed to have characteristics and cognitions that are roughly equal to those of every other member. It is also possible to conceive of the collectivity as a unit having single relevant characteristics (e.g., exhibiting single relevant behaviors) or holding single relevant cognitions, though this is a bit absurd.

Both 'group mind' concepts and the assumption of identical behaviors and cognitions are clearly invalid. The fact of individual differences is obvious in everyday experience, and is well-documented for role phenomena (Stouffer, 1949; Gross, Mason and McEachern, 1958; Biddle, Rosencranz and Rankin, 1961).

A central-tendency orientation to the problem seems closest to reality of the three possibilities mentioned above, and is probably the most widely used. However, a mere central-tendency approach to the study of characteristics and cognitions of collectivities ignores the fact of variance. At any rate, the matter is left open in the definitions proposed above, and is not often considered in the literature.

There is, however, some justification for treating the variables involving collectivities in an ideal-typical form. The first reason is practical but not too convincing: most role theorists have stated propositions without regard for the variance implicit in the operations defining their variables. The second reason has more merit: it is suspected that people in general tend actually to hold such simplifying cognitions for the characteristics and cognitions of identifiable collectivities.

7. Varieties of consensus. Consensus, the inverse of cognitive variance, is a widely used concept in role propositions, even though the fact of variance is ignored in many context in which it is applicable. The present treatment of 'consensus' is taken in part from a more exhaustive discussion found in Volume A.

Several varieties of consensus may be distinguished. Among them are:

1. Own sharing - inverse of variance between first-order cognitions of the same type held among a set of persons, or sets of persons. (OwnShr)

   OwnShr [type of 1st-order cognition ; veridicality ; S's ; O ; T ;

   content ; background ; A ; method].

2. Attributed sharing - inverse of variance between second-order cognitions of the same type held among a set of persons or sets of persons. (AttShr)

   AttShr [type of 2nd-order cognition ; accuracy ; S's ; S-O ; O ; T ;

   content ; background ; A ; method].

A variation of common consensus may be called attributed consensus. The latter, as the term implies, refers to cognitive sharing as attributed (with more or less accuracy) by a single set of persons. Although this set may include part, or all, of the set to whom common consenuus is attributed, it is nevertheless important to distinguish whether a proposition refers to consensus as it actually exists, or rather to consensus as it is thought to exist. These two are quite different variables though they are related and have not infrequently been equated by theorists, for instance, Hilmar (1955), and Manwiller (1958).

The variable code for attributed consensus was:

AttCns [type of 2nd-order cognition ; accuracy ; veridicality ;
S ; S-O's ; O ; T ; content ; background ; A ; method].

One terminological peculiarity sometimes found in the literature is the labelling of what amounts to a condition of a relative lack of OwnShr or AttCns as 'role conflict.' The term might well be avoided. First, it is used to refer to a variety of phenomena (cf. the discussion of the varieties of role conflict in Biddle and Twyman, 1960), sometimes without specification of which variety is meant. Second, it is an overloaded concept which in the hands of some theorists assumes a tighter relationship than is warranted between cognitive disparities and individual conflict or anguish. Third, there is a tendency for it to be posed apart from considerations of consensus, to which most forms of it is inextricably linked.

Bibliographic Conventions. The arrangement of each reference in the annotated bibliography is as follows:

1. bibliographic citation.
2. propositions.
3. notes.

Each reference is numbered, and propositions within each reference are also numbered. Whether or not the proposition was tested is indicated in the notes, as is the nature of the sample used, and the results of the empirical test, if applicable. In some cases, the proposition as stated by the author differed somewhat from the proposition as actually tested. In such cases, a second code is used, unless the difference between theory and empirical practice can be easily explained in the notes. For instance, if an author stated a proposition about conformity and went through the operations of measuring optimism, two codes for the proposition are listed. These are lettered a and b.

If on the other hand an author stated a proposition so that it could be coded at a fairly high level of generality and the proposition as tested differed only in terms of specificity, one code is used. For instance, if the proposition was set forth for professional positions in general and tested for lawyers, the term 'professional position' is used in the code and a note that the professional position = lawyers is added. Since the practice in coding propositions was to state them at the highest level of generality that could reasonable by assumed from the author's discussion, many coded propositions have utilized this convention.

A third possibility was that the proposition and the operationalization differed only in specificity, but the nature of the difference was too complicated to be indicated economically in a note; this was the case for some varieties of consensus, for instance.

If the proposition was not reported tested in the article or other publication in which it was set forth, some note such as 'theoretical paper' or 'theoretical proposition in an empirical paper' has been added.

In the following discussion references to the propositions in the appendix are by article and proposition number. For example, (10.2a) refers to the second proposition as tested, in the tenth article.

Variables Involved in Propositions

Variables Used. Tables 3.1 through 3.4 display the independent-dependent variable relationships for 124 coded propositions. The vertical axes of these figures display dependent variables while the horizontal axes display independent variables. Entries in the cells of the tables are reference notes. Each note denotes that a proposition belonging in that cell was stated by the indicated author. When a reference note is underlined, the proposition indicated was either not tested by the author or no empirical support for it was reported.

Table 3.1

Propositions Containing Basic Element Variables as Independent Variables

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

-------	behavior	expectation	norm	other first order cognition	attributed expectation	attributed norm
behavior	Cottrell, 1933					
expectation		Bar-Yosef & Schild, 1960 Cottrell, 1933 Mason & Gross, 1955 Rose, 1951 Rose, 1951				
norm			Cottrell, 1933			
other first order cognitions				Gross, et al, 1958		
attributed expectation					Bar-Yosef & Schild, 1960 Cottrell, 1933	
attributed norm						Bar-Yosef & Schild, 1960 Cottrell,1933
first order conformity		Goode, 1960b	Goode, 1960b			
optimism		Hilmar, 1955				
own sharing	Bogen, 1954					
attributed consensus	Bogen, 1954					
other	Bott, 1956*	Mason & Gross, 1955	Wispe & Lloyd, 1955			

____ = not tested

* = other role dependent variables

Non-underlined notes refer to propositions which have received empirical confirmation. If more than one proposition was stated by an author within any cell the number of propositions is indicated in a parenthesis following the reference note.

In preparing these tables we have deleted all role variables for which not more than one proposition using that variable could be found. This means that a number of conceptual distinctions made in this chapter are unrepresented in Tables 3.1 through 3.4. The final list of variables found in these tables includes:

Behaviors (as reflective of role cognitions)
Expectations
Norms
Other first order cognitions (with alternate orientations)
Attributed expectations
Attributed norms
Sanctions
Identified sanctions
First order conformity (behavior which conforms to first order cognitions)
Second order conformity (behavior which conforms to second order cognitions)
Optimism
Accuracy
Veridicality
Own sharing (sharing of own cognitions)
Attributed sharing (sharing of cognitions attributed to others)
Attributed consensus
Other role variables (including both the distinctions made in this monograph and others)
Non-role Variables (including variables from other theoretical systems)

These variables, then, have constituted the dominating concerns of role theorists according to our data.

Overall Popularity of the Variables. Table 3.5 shows the usage of variables for independent and dependent purposes in both tested and non-tested propositions. Total usage in all propositions is also shown.

Sharing was by far the most popular role variable indicated in Table 3.5. It was found almost three times as much as the second most popular variable, first order conformity. Expectations followed as a lagging third; with attributed

Table 3.2

Propositions Containing Comparison-Variables as Independent Variables

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

DEPENDENT VARIABLES	first order conformity	second order conformity	optimism	accuracy
behavior	Bidwell, 1955 Klapp, 1958			
expectation			Bidwell, 1955	
sanction	Bidwell, 1955			
own sharing	Lieberman, 1956(2)			
non-role variables	Corwin, et al, 1960 Cottrell, 1933 Goode, 1960a Goode, 1960b Gross, et al, 1958 (2) Olmstead, D.W., 1957 Ort, 1950	Corwin, et al 1960	Bidwell, 1957 Gross, et al, 1958 (2)	Bogen, 1954 (2) Bott, 1956 Ghiselli & Barthol, 1956

____ = not tested

consensus, behavior, optimism, accuracy, and second order conformity following in descending order or total usage.

That sharing occured more often than attributed consensus, and first order conformity occured more often than second order conformity may testify to a sociological bias among the authors, regardless of their professional affiliation. The distinction was seldom made between actual consensus among role cognitions held by significant alters, and the more psychological attribution of consensus. Again, few attempts were made to distinguish between conformity to the actual cognitions of others and to the cognitions about the cognitions of others. This is reminiscent of the tradition in anthropology of assuming that beliefs and values are uniformly internalized by all members of a given social system.

It should be pointed out that basic-element variables showed lower frequencies than their usage warrants, since they were often measured and theorized about in the context of more complex variables. However, ausvalued norms and expectations were neither used alone as variables nor as parts of more complex variables such as second order conformity or attributed consensus.

Usage in Tested vs. Non-Tested Propositions. Overall, role variables were used more often in tested propositions than in non-tested propositions (see Table 3.5). One implication that might be drawn from this is that role theory has its feet firmly in the empirical, not so firmly that it can't speculate--with only 12 fewer non-tested than test propositions. This implication does not clearly follow, however.

First, much speculation in the literature is not represented in Table 3.5 for reasons mentioned earlier. (This non-included speculation may perhaps be balanced out by a large group of empirical studies also not included because no hypotheses were tested.)

Table 3.3

Propositions Containing Consensus Variables as Independent Variables

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

		own sharing	attributed sharing	attributed consensus
	behavior	Hilmar, 1955 Rappert & Rosow, 1957		Getzels & Guba, 1954
	expectation	Gullahorn, 1956		Getzels & Guba, 1954
	first order conformity	Gross, et al,1958		Gross, et al,1958(3)
	second order conformity			
	optimism	Gross, et al, 1958		
DEPENDENT VARIABLES	own sharing	Pendelton, 1956		
	attributed sharing	Hilmar, 1955		
	attributed consensus	Getzels and Guba, 1954		
	other	Corwin, et al,1960 Corwin, et al,1960 Davis, 1954 Ghiselli & Barthol,1956 Gross, et al, 1958 (3) Gullahorn, 1956 Jacobson, 1952 Jacobson, et al, 1951 Jacobson, et al, 1951 Olmstead, D.W.,1957 Pendelton, 1956 Rose, 1951 Wardwell, 1955a Wispe & Thayer, 1957 Videbeck & Bates,1959*	Manwiller, 1958 Manwiller, 1958	Brookover, 1955 Gross, et al, 1958

_____ = not tested

* = other role dependent variables

Second, there is some question as to just how firm the empirical roots are. Attributed expectations and norms as single variables, sanctions and veridicality were not used in any tested propositions; and norms and other first order cognitions as single variables, identified sanctions, accuracy, and consensual attribution were used in only one or two tested propositions apiece. More popular variables--even sharing, with a frequency of 36--were seldom used in propositions that had more than one test, much less replication by other investigators. Questions may also be raised as to the adequacy of operations employed in some of the empirical studies.

Criticism along this line is not really justified, at this point, however. Of the 39 coded references but one is more than twelve years old.

Sharing, attributed consensus, and optimism were relatively high-usage variables that occurred more often in tested than in non-tested propositions. That the first two have been studied testifies to an empirical concern with the question of cognitive variance. Optimism, unlike consensus, occurred in no untested propositions, from which one may infer that as a concept it has not interested more speculative writers (or that nothing like it has occurred to them in the context of role discussions). Actually, the concept of 'optimism' has not been clearly handled by authors of empirical papers either. In several cases the variable allegedly tested by operations defining optimism was actually first order conformity.

First order conformity, behavior, attributed expectations and norms, and sanctions are relatively high-usage variables that occurred more often in non-tested propositions. The presence of 'behavior' in this light may be attributed to the difficulty of actual behavioral observation. The same reason probably holds for first order conformity and sanction, both of which are complex variables involving behavior. Even for the propositions marked 'tested' that

Table 3.4

Propositions Containing Other Variables as Independent Variables

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

		sanction	attributed sanction	other role variables	non-role variables
EPENDENT VARIABLES	behavior			Rommetveit,1954(2)	
	first order conformity			Videbeck & Bates, 1959	Bar-Yosef & Schild, 1960 Hall, 1955 Hilmar, 1955
	second order conformity				Hilmar, 1955
	optimism				Hall, 1955
	accuracy			Rommetveit,1954 Rommetveit,1954	
	veridicality				Hall, 1955
	own sharing		Gullahorn, 1956	Gross, et al 1958 (2)	Couch, 1958 Gross, et al,1958(2) Gross, et al,1958(14) Hall, 1955 Hall, 1955 (2) Rommetviet, 1954
	attributed consensus				Getzels & Guba, 1955b Monk & Newcomb,1956(2)
	sanction	Bidwell, 1955			
	others	Goode, 1960a*	Goode, 1960a* Rommetveit, 1954*	Raven & French, 1958* Raven & French, 1958 Rommetveit, 1954* Hilmar, 1957	Hilmar, 1955* Rommetveit,1954* Rommetveit,1954

____ = not tested

* = other role dependent variables

used behavior or a constructed concept involving behavior such as first order conformity, there is some question as to just how much actual behavior was observed and how well, excect for a few small group studies.

Dependent vs. Independent Variable Usage. Role variables were used as independent variables more often than as dependent variables in the references coded. The same relationship holds for usage in untested propositions alone. But for tested propositions, role variables more often served as dependent variables.

Behavior, conformity, second order sharing, and veridicality were used more often as dependent than as independent variables considering both tested and untested propositions. Norm, identified santions, first order conformity, optimism, accuracy, attributed consensus, and attributed sharing were more often used as independent variables. The general trend here is that variables which were 'more' cognitive tended to be conceptualized as implying 'less' cognitive variables. For instance, sharing (which has to do only with 1st-order cognitions) was used more often as a dependent variable, whereas attributed consensus and attributed sharing (both of which emphasize 2nd-order cognitions) were used more often as independent variables. And the greater frequency reported for behavior as a dependent variable may be contrasted with the complete lack of identified sanction used as a dependent variable when the latter deals with cognized behavior.

In tested propositions only, behavior, expectation, first order conformity, second order conformity, and sharing were used more often as dependent variables; and norm, identified santions, optimism, and attributed consensus were used more often as independent variables. In untested propositions, behavior and veridicality had higher incidence as dependent variables; and expectations, norms,identified sanctions, first order conformity, second order conformity, accuracy, and attributed consensus occurred more frequently as independent

Table 3.5

Usage of Role and Non-Role Variables in Tested and Untested Propositions and as Independent and Dependent Variables

	independent variables			dependent variables					
	tested	not tested	total	tested	not tested	total	total tested	total not tested	total usage
behavior	0	4	4	3	5	8	3	9	12
expectation	3	5	8	5	3	8	8	8	16
norm	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	3	4
other first order cog's.	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	2
attributed expectation	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	4	4
attributed norm	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	4	4
sanction	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	4	4
identified sanction	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	3
first order conformity	1	12	13	3	4	7	4	16	20
second order conformity	0	1	1	4	0	4	4	1	5
optimism	4	0	4	2	0	2	6	0	6
accuracy	1	3	4	1	1	2	2	4	6
veridicality	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
own sharing	16	8	24	20	8	28	36	16	52
attributed sharing	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	3
attributed consensus	5	2	7	4	1	5	9	3	12
other role variables	9	2	11	5	4	9	14	6	20
total role	44	47	91	49	34	83	93	81	174
non-role variables	26	7	33	21	20	41	47	27	74
total role & non-role	70	54	124	70	54	124	140	108	248

variables. Only behavior was used more frequently both in tested and untested propositions as a dependent variables; and norms, identified sanctions, and attributed consensus had greater relative frequencies for both speculative and empirical work.

Again, the slight general trend for both tested and untested propositions was for the 'more'cognitive to imply the 'less' cognitive, considering only relative frequencies.

Propositions Using Coded Role Variables Only

Role variables were related to other role variables in 54 propositions, and coded role variables were related to other coded role variables in only 37. Frequency of relation of any one role variable to any other role variable was not great enough to warrant much discussion.

Propositions Using Non-Coded Role Variables

In Tables 3.1 through 3.4, some propositions were referenced in cells as involving non-coded variables. These 'other role variables' included combinations of coded variables (Goode, 1960a; Rommetveit, 1954); coded variables plus some modifier--"ease of stating norms and attributed norms" (Bott, 1958) and "strength of norms" (Videbeck and Bates, 1959); or still others that are clearly within the province of role theory. Among the latter were several dealing with positional membership (Gross, et al, 1958; Raven and French, 1958) a variable used by Rommetveit (1954) involving positional "potency," two dealing with behavior mapping (Rommetveit, 1954), and "codification of obligations" (Gross et al, 1958).

Bott's variable "ease of stating norms" is similar to the concept of saliency of role-cognitions. "Norm strength," as used by Videbeck and Bates might be translated as 'saliency of attributed norms,' or thought of in terms of some sort of behavioral 'pressure.'

The matter of how role-cognitions are conveyed from one person to another, and the related matter of how other's role-cognitions affect behavior need more analysis. The first would involve a study of 'cues,' and the second would include consideration of the saliency and importance of role-cognitions and what factors affect them, and very likely some consideration of what Rommetveit calls positional "potency" (though this concept borders on the circular in Rommetveit's proposed operationalization).

Another question that has been neglected is how positions are identified. A related issue is the designation of positions. Common practice is to study commonly designated positions--e.g., school teacher, Air Force sergeant--but how about non-designated or non-labelled positions? Might these be somehow different?

Propositions Using Non-Role Variables

By far the largest number of heavily loaded cells in Tables 3.1 through 3.4 occured when one of the variables fell into the non-role category. Non-role variables served as independent variables 41 times and dependent variables 31 times. In contrast, role concepts as variables were related to other role variables in only 53 of the 124 propositions listed in Tables 3.1 through 3.4. One implication is that there have been many attempts to relate role theory to other theoretical areas. This is fairly clear for some of the propositions in Gross, et al (1958) in which institutional theory is the alternate theoretical area. Another possible implication is that role concepts have often been used as nice-sounding and convenient constructs to relate not to other theoretical areas but to subject-matter areas of interest to the researcher. The latter would be closely related to the use of role variables as analytical tools, without the benefit of propositional structure.

Happiness or Satisfaction. What might be termed 'happiness' occured frequently among non-role variables. One variety of this variable has to do with happiness or unhappiness with one's own condition, while a second variety has to do with approval or disapproval of some other actor or position, often in terms of job performance. Various labels for happiness included: 'job satisfaction,' 'anxiety,' 'worry,' 'positional satisfaction,' on the one hand; and 'job success,' 'ratings by superiors,' and 'affective evaluation of person 1,' on the other.

The happiness variable, loosely defined, was found in at least 20 of the 71 non-role propositions. Few authors were so naive as to use the term 'happiness,' but there seemed to be a widespread usage of other terms that could easily be lumped into this category.

Satisfaction or dissatisfaction with one's own position was found most often as a dependent variable. Among the independent variables found linked with it were sharing (Davis, 1954; Gross, et al, 1958; Rose, 1951; Wardwell, 1955; Wispe and Thayer, 1957), first order conformity (Goode, 1960b; Gross, et al, 1958; Ort, 1950), optimism (Bidwell, 1957; Gross, et al, 1958), attributed consensus (Manwiller, 1958 (2)), and attributed sharing (Gross, et al, 1958). Affective evaluation of a position or social system including the evaluator, or else happiness or anxiety without any cognised reference to a position, served as an independent variable for sharing (Hall, 1955), attributed consensus (Monk and Newcomb, 1956), second order conformity (Hilmar, 1955), and avoidance of deviance from attributed norms (Hilmar, 1955). In general, relations between the happiness variable and role variables have received more empirical support when the former is a dependent variable.

Almost without exception, 'satisfaction' was hypothesized to increase as conformity or consensus or optimism increased. The drift of most theorizing in the area was that job satisfaction, marital adjustment, affection for one's position, and good feeling all around would approach assymptotic heights and that anxiety and worry would approach assymtotic lows in a social situation characterized by very high consensus about role cognitions and perfect behavioral conformity to these cognitions.

Happiness with Others and Successful Social Activity. Two propositions dealt with affective evaluation of another person or position (Hilmar, 1955; Rommetveit, 1954), and were related to uniformity and sharing respectively. Several others were concerned with evaluations of the performance of another person or position, usually in a vocational setting (Corwin, et al, 1960 (3); Davis, 1954; Ghiselli and Barthol, 1956 (2); Gross, et al, 1958 (3)). The most frequently used independent variable for the latter was sharing; however, in two propositions (Gross, et al, 1958), the independent variables were first order conformity and optimism.

Performance evaluation is of course not strictly a case of the 'happiness' variable. It is also in the domain of what might be termed 'successful social activity.' Examples of the latter coded in this study were marital adjustment (Cottrell, 1933, independent variable = first order conformity), general social adjustment assessed in a vocational setting (Davis, 1954, independent variable = sharing), group cohesion (Hall, 1955 (2), dependent variable = sharing; Hall, 1955 (2), dependent variables = veridicality, optimism), marital compatibility (Jacobson, 1952, independent variable = sharing), and ease of interpersonal relations (Jacobson, et al, 1951, independent variable = sharing).

It is obvious that what was labelled 'successful social activity' skirts the subject of social integration and organization--indeed, may be in its lap. Furthermore, it may well be that the following proposition is assumed by some theorists: 'Smooth behavioral social integration leads to happiness.'

Summarizing this set of related propositions, conformity and consensus have been presumed related to happiness, successful performance, positive evaluation of others, and cohesion of one sort or another. This multiple usage implies that many of these notions are interrelated in the assumptions, if not in the actual theories, of at least some and probably quite a few social scientists.

Empirical Status of 'Success' and 'Happiness'. The empirical support of the 'successful social activity' propositions was not as extensive as for the 'happiness' or evaluation propositions. Evidence tended to be of a more informal sort, which is understandable considering the predilection in the social sciences for questionnaires and rating scales. Behavioral observation methods that are suited to convincing tests of the propositions in question are difficult and time-consuming.

Nor was the assumed close positive relationship between 'happiness' and 'successful social activity' clearly supported. At least within the boundaries of role theory, it has not received enough conceptual clarification to test, though indirect support can be gleaned from 'happiness' studies and 'activity' studies that use common role variables.

At least one theorist, Goode (1960a,b) has challenged the notion that perfect consensus and conformity would result in perfect social integration and organization. Goode postulates that extremely high consensus and conformity is, indeed, impossible for any social system, and that social cohesiveness (or organization, etc.--any of several generally loosely defined terms will do) is dependent upon a lack of consensus and what he calls "role strain." However, Goode does not challenge the relationship of conformity to 'happiness,' which he speaks of in the negative using the terms "anxiety" and "strain."

The drift of much theorizing in the area is that happiness and consensus are monotonically, even linearly, related. On a hypothetical continuum with complete consensus or complete conformity on one end and complete lack of consensus or conformity on the other, some theorists have focussed on small areas toward the ends. Others have merely exmained the antecedants or consequents of more or less consensus or conformity, without any anchorange toward one end or the other. With both approaches, the precise nature of the relationships remains largely unexamined, and the unjustified assumption of linearity hangs on.

Conclusions

On first glance it would seem discouraging in the extreme that out of several hundred 'theoretical' contributions to role theory only 39 had sufficiently clear propositions that could be summarized in terms of a common system of concepts. In retrospect, the most important factors contributing to the scarcity of honest-to-goodness role propositions seem to be:

1. Lack of clearly defined terms.
2. Informal and occasionally vague discussion of role-related concepts and processes.
3. Shifting referents within one discussion - 'role' sometimes referring to behavior and sometimes to cognitions, for instance.
4. Discussion of so abstract a nature that empirical anchorage would be difficult.
5. Discussion of such a specific (but not theoretically specific) nature that generalization is difficult.
6. A widespread use of role-related concepts for purely descriptive purposes with no attempt to relate variables.

Despite these difficulties, role theory does show signs of vitality. In the first place, but one of these references would have been available to Neiman and Hughes in 1951. And even though many of the propositions summarized here had to be pieced together from several pages of discussion or else imaginatively constructed from clues strewn about by the authors, some investigators have stated fairly clear propositions and tested hypotheses that are unambiguously related to them. Among these latter are Gross, et al (1958), Videbeck and Bates (1960), and Rommetveit (1954).

In summary, the major findings of this chapter were:

1. Sharing and conformity are the most prevalent role concepts about which propositions have been stated.
2. In general, role variables involving second order cognitions have been slighted.

3. Empirical tests of role variables involving actual measurement of behavior are few to nonexistent.

4. Role variables have been related to non-role variables more often than to other role variables.

5. The most numerous delineable set of related propositions has to do with personal 'happiness,' evaluation of others, and smooth social activity.

6. Untested role propositions have tended to emphasize 'more cognitive' independent and 'less cognitive' dependent variables, while tested role propositions have more often used concepts as dependent variables.

7. Much terminological confusion as well as terminological diversity, exists in the role literature.

8. Role theory, as a set of unified propositions, does not presently exist. However, propositions are now being stated and tested. The field shows promise.

A CODED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ROLE PROPOSITIONS

1. Bar-Yosef, R. and Schild, E. Role deviation in bureaucratic occupations: an approach derived from expectancy theory. Unpublished paper, Hebrew University (received March, 1960).

(1) E [$per_1 \supset$ bureaucratic organization ; $per_2 \supset$ bureaucratic organization ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

E [$per_1 \supset$ bureaucratic organization ; per_3 perceived by per_1 to be similar to per_2 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

(2) AE, AN [$per_1 \supset$ bureaucratic organization ; $per_2 \supset$ bur. org. ; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

AE, AN [$per_1 \supset$ bur. org. ; per_3 perceived by per_1 to be similar to per_2 ; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -].

(3) $\overset{+}{\text{Efficient}}$ channels of communication between authority and subordinate in a bureaucratic organization $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{Con}}_1$ [${}^{E}_{N}$; authority ; subordinate ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

A theoretical paper.

2. Bidwell, C. E. The administrative role and satisfaction in teaching. *Journal of Educational Sociology* (1955), 29:41-6.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{Opt}}$ [teachers ; school officials ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

E [teachers ; teachers and officials ; - ; $\overset{+}{\text{closeness}}$ of relationship between teachers and school officials ; working ; - ; -].

Submitted to test and accepted.

(2) $\overset{-}{\text{Con}}_1$ [E's ; teacher ; school official ; teacher ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

Beh [teacher ; school official ; "of an $\overset{-}{\text{effective}}$ nature" ; - ; - ; -].

(3) $\overset{-}{\text{Con}}_1$ [E's ; teacher ; school official ; teacher ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{tendency}}$ for Snc_1 [teacher ; school official ; negative ; - ; - ; teacher ; - ; - ; -].

(4) Snc [subordinate ; administrator ; negative ; administrative situation ; - ; subordinate ; - ; - ; - ; -] => Snc [administrator ; subordinate ; negative ; - ; - ; administrator ; negative snc_1 ; adm. sit. ; - ; -].

Two, three and four are from the theoretical discussion in an empirical paper.

3. Bidwell, C. E. Some effects of administrative behavior: a study in role theory. Administrative Science Quarterly (1957-58), 2:163-81.

$\overset{+}{\text{Opt}}$ [teachers ; school officials ; - ; - ; in school settings ; - ; Q-sort] =>

$\overset{+}{\text{satisfaction}}$ with teaching position.

Empirically tested and confirmed.

4. Bogen, I. Pupil-teacher rapport and the teacher's awareness of status structures within the group. Journal of Educational Sociology (1954), 28:104-14.

$\overset{+}{\text{Acc}}$ [E ; AE ; p_1 ; p_2 ; p_2 ; - ; status relations within p_2 ; - ; - ; -] =>

$\overset{+}{\text{availability}}$ of power to p_1 over p_2.

as tested -

$\overset{+}{\text{Acc}}$ [E ; AE ; p_1 ; p_2 ; p_2 ; - ; status relations within p_2 ; - ; - ;

questionnaire to p_1 and a
paralleling sociometric
test to p_2.] => $\overset{+}{\text{degree}}$ to which p_2 will obey instructions of p_1.

Empirically confirmed where p_1 = teacher and p_2 = pupils

5. Bott, E. Urban families: the norms of conjugal roles. Human Relations (1958), 9:325-42.

(1) Beh [hcl_x ; hcl_x ; - ; - ; - ; -] in terms of $\overset{+}{\text{amount}}$ of interaction and $\overset{+}{\text{number}}$ of relationships within hcl X => $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N's ; - ; hcl_x ; per_x ; members of per X's family ; - ; - ; - ; -].

(2) Beh [as in proposition 1] => $\overset{+}{\text{AttCns}}$ [AN ; $\overset{+}{\text{accurate}}$; per 1 $\supset$ hcl X ; hcl X ; any per X ; family members of per X ; p ; - ; - ; -].

(3) Beh [as in proposition 1] => $\overset{+}{\text{ease}}$ with which per 1 can explicity state

N [per 1 $\supset$ hcl$_x$; any per$_x$; members of family of per$_x$; - ; - ; -]

and AN [per 1 $\supset$ hcl$_x$; hcl$_x$; any per$_x$; members of family of per$_x$;

- ; - ; -].

Theoretical discussion based on findings of a field study.

6. Brookover, W. B. Research on teacher and administrator roles. *Journal of Educational Sociology* (1955), 29:2-13.

AttCns [AE ; + ; teacher;students ; teacher ; students ; - ; - ; - ; -] =>

$\overset{+}{\text{effective}}$ communication of the teacher with the students.

A theoretical paper. Note that nothing is said about the degree of consensus; it may be high or low, and the accuracy-effectiveness relationship still holds.

7. Corwin, R., et al. Social requirements for occupational success: internalized norms and friendships. *Social Forces* (1960), 39:135-39.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; per $\supset$ work-grp$_1$, bosses of work-grp$_1$;

p$_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] =>

job $\overset{+}{\text{success}}$ of per$_1$.

as tested:

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; nurses ; head nurses and supervisors ;

nurses ; - ; several ; hospital setting ; - ; 200-item

$\overset{+}{\text{Likert}}$-type "role behavior inventory"] =>

job success of nurses as rated by head nurses and supervisors.

Empirical study. The hypothesis was not supported.

(2) Con$_1$ [N ; bosses of work-grp$_1$; per$_1$ $\supset$ grp$_1$; - ; - ; job

settings ; - ; -] =>

job success for per$_1$.

(3) Con$_2$ [AN ; per$_1$ $\supset$ work-grp$_1$; bosses of work-grp$_1$;

per$_1$ $\supset$ grp$_1$; - ; - ; job settings ; -] =>

job success for per$_1$.

Additional propositions (untested).

8. Cottrell, L. S. Roles and marital adjustment. American Sociological Review (1933), 27:107-15.

(1) Beh [per 1 as a child or adolescent; family members ; - ;
situations similar to ss_x ; -] ⇒ $\simeq$
Beh [per_1 ; per_2 ; - ; some ss_x in at least the early stages of
marriage ; - ; -].

(2) N's, E's [per_1 as a child or adolescent ; certain family members ;
per_1 as a child or adolescent ; situations similar to ; - ; - ; -] ⇒
ss_x
N's, E's [per_1 ; per_2 ; per_1 ; same ss_x during early marriage
; - ; - ; -].

(3) AE's, AN's [per_1 as a child or adolescent ; certain family members;
per_1 as a child or adolescent ; certain family members ;
situations similar to ss_x ; - ; -] ⇒
AE's, AN's [per_1 ; per_2 ; per_1 ; per_2 ; some sit_x during at least
the early stages of marriage ; - ; -].

(4) C$\bar{o}$n$_1$ [E's, N's as in proposition 2 above ; per_1 ; per_2 ; per_1 ; - ;
relevant situations as in (2) above ; - ; -] ⇒
mar$\overset{+}{\text{i}}$tal maladjustment.

where: per_1 and per_2 are married.

A theoretical article.

9. Couch, C. J. The use of the concept 'role' and its derivatives in a study of marriage. Marriage and Family Living (November, 1958), 20:353-7.

Length of marriage ⇒ Ow$\overset{+}{\text{n}}$Shr [E ; - ; husbands and wives ;
set of college
married couples

such husbands and wives ; - ; - ; - ; - ; closed-ended questionnaire] .

An empirical study of 32 college couples half of whom were married less than two years. The proposition was derived ad hoc from this pilot investigation.

10. Davis, F. J. Conceptions of official leader roles in the air force. Social Forces (1954), 32:253-58.

(1) Lack of OwnShr [E's ; - ; airmen, Air Force leaders ; A.F. leaders ; - ; - ; A. F. settings ; - ; questionnaire] is the case.

(2) Ow$\overset{+}{n}$Shr [E's ; - ; airmen, A.F. leaders ; A.F. leaders ; - ; - ; A.F. settings ; - ; questionnaire] $\Rightarrow$ a) follower adjustment
b) job satisfaction by airmen
c) good rating by superiors

Empirical study. Both hypotheses were rejected.

11. Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. Role, role conflict and effectiveness: an empirical study. American Sociological Review (April, 1954) 19:164-75.

(1) Ow$\bar{n}$Shr [$\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{N}{E}$; - ; S_1 ; $p_1 \supset S_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$ At$\bar{t}$Cns [$\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{AN}{AE}$; - ; $p_1 \supset S_1$; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

(2) a. At$\bar{t}$Cns [$\genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{AN}{AE}$; - ; $p_1 \supset S_1$; S_1 ; $p_1 \supset S_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$ B$\bar{e}$h [$p_1 \supset S_1$; - ; tendency to reach certain end-states ; - ; - ; -].
as tested-

b. At$\bar{t}$Cns [as above] $\Rightarrow$ E [$p_1 \supset S_1$; $p_1 \supset S_1$; - ; tendency to reach certain end-states established by experimenter - ; - ; individual rating sheets].

Empirical. Subjects were officer-teachers in Air Force college. Both accepted.

12. Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. The structure of roles and role conflict in the teaching situation. Journal of Educational Sociology (1955) 29:30-40.

Certain personal and social characteristics of teachers $\Rightarrow$ AttCns [- ; - ; teachers ; community ; teachers ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Never clearly stated by the authors, who attempted to verify this relationship in a study of teachers and pupils. Verified for nine characteristics, including sex, existence of dependents, part-time job-holding, similarity of home community to community taught in, feelings of restriction in social life, self-attributed personal influence, self-attributed adequacy of relationships with superordinates, feelings about entering profession again if given a chance.

13. Ghiselli, E. E. and Barthol, R. Role perceptions of successful and unsuccessful supervisors. Journal of Applied Psychology (1956), 40:241-44.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [E's ; - ; supervisors, 1st-line operator ; 1st-line operator ; - ; behavior indicative of certain "traits" ; - ; - ; -] => appr$\overset{+}{\text{o}}$val by supervisors for the 1st-line operator.

(2) $\overset{-}{\text{Acc}}$ [E's ; AE's ; 1st-line operator ; supervisors ; 1st-line operator ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] => disapp$\overset{-}{\text{r}}$oval by supervisors of 1st-line operator.

It is assumed that there is $\overset{+}{\text{Con}}_2$ [AE's ; 1st-line operator ; supervisors ; 1st-line operator ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Theoretical discussion in an empirical paper. Neither proposition was tested.

14. Goode, W. J. A theory of role strain. American Sociological Review (1960), 25:483-496.

(1) lack of OwnShr [N's ; - ; per_1 ; others ; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] is the usual case in any hcl in which the members all interact with per_1.

(2) $\overset{-}{\text{Con}}_1$ [N ; per_1 ; per_1 ; per_2 ; amount of effort and time spent in relationship with per_2 ; relevant settings ; - ; -] => per_1 feels str$\overset{+}{\text{a}}$in, worry, anxiety.

(3) total set of E's, N's [all people ; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] => Con_1 [some relatively small subset of E's, N's above; all people ; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

A theoretical article.

15. Goode, W. J. Norm commitment and conformity to role-status obligations. American Journal of Sociology (1960, 66:246-58.

(1) lack of Con_1 [E's ; per_1 ; per_2 ; - ; any behavior ; any situation ; - ; - ; -] =>

per_1 feels that per_2 should change his behavior.

(2) N, E [stranger$_1$; stranger$_2$; stranger$_1$; - ; civility and "reciprocity" and perhaps unspecified others ; - ; -] is always the case.

(3) Snc [others ; per$_1$; - ; - ; - ; ; - ; some beh$_x$; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$ N [per$_1$; per$_1$; - ; some beh$_x$; - ; - ; -] $\approx$ AN [per$_1$; others ; per$_1$; - ; some beh$_x$; - ; - ; -].

(4) IdnSnc [per$_1$; others ; per$_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; some beh$_x$; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$ N [per$_1$; per$_1$; - ; some beh$_x$; - ; - ; -] $\approx$ AN [per$_1$; other ; per$_1$; - ; some beh$_x$; - ; -

A theoretical article.

16. Gross, N., Mason, W. S., and McEachern, A. W. Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1958.

Chapter 8:

(1) Where there is a division of responsibility between p$_1$ and p$_2$ of a hierarchical system, S$_1$ for behaviors$_{1...x}$ all relevant to S$_1$,

C ("perception")*[p$_1$; p$_1$; - ; necessity of p$_1$ for beh$_{1...x}$; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

C ("perception")* [p$_2$; p$_1$; - ; necessity of p$_1$ for beh$_{1...x}$; - ; - ; -].

*This concept is similar to but not exactly the same as any of our 1st order cognitions.

Empirically accepted where S$_1$ ≡ school system, p$_1$ ≡ superintendents, p$_2$ = school board members.

(2) Membership of per$_1$ in both S$_1$ and S$_2$ $\Rightarrow$

OwnShr [$\substack{N \\ E}$; - ; per$_1$ $\supset$ S$_1$ and S$_2$, S$_1$; p$_{1...x}$ which are influenced by identification of per$_1$ with S$_1$. S$_1$; - ; - ;

- ; - ; -]

- ; - ; - ; - ; -]

Empirically tested and accepted, where per$_1$ ≡ School Superintendent, S$_1$ ≡ schools, S$_2$ ≡ community, p$_1$ ≡ School Board.

(3) Not coded:

. . . In defining the line of authority in a formal organization, position incumbents will be less likely to accept or more likely to reject a by-pass of their own position than are position incumbents who participate in the by-pass.

Chapter 9:

(4) a. $\overset{+}{\text{Homogeneity}}$ of socialization of $\text{per}_{1\ldots n} \supset p_1 \supset S_1$ => $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [E ; - ; within p_1 ; any $p_{2\ldots x} \supset S_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

as tested-

b. OwnShr [E ; - ; school superintendents ; school superintendents and board members ; - ; behaviors$_{1\ldots x}$; in-school st$_y$; - ; -] > OwnShr [E ; - ; school board members ; school superintendents and board members ; - ; behaviors$_{1\ldots x}$; st$_y$; - ; -].

Tested and accepted, by item.

(5) OwnShr [E ; - ; $p_1 \supset S_1$ and a superordinate $p_2 \supset S_1$; p_1 ; - ; pseudo-features "necessary" for membership in $p_1 \supset S_1$ involving behaviors$_{1\ldots x}$; - ; - ; -] > OwnShr [E ; - ; $p_1 \supset S_1$, $p_2 \supset S_1$; p_1 ; - ; behavior$_{1\ldots x}$; - ; - ; -].

Empirical. Accepted. $p_1 \equiv$ school superintendents, $p_2 \equiv$ board members.

(6) The codification of "obligations" of $p_2 \supset S_1$ => OwnShr [N ; - ; any $p_x \supset S_1$; $p_2 \supset S_1$; - ; in re: their "obligations" ; - ; - ; -].

Accepted after empirical examination, sample as before.

(7) Where p_1 is subordinate to p_2 in any hierarchical system, S.

$\overset{+}{\text{Size}}$ of S => Responsibility assigned to p_1 (relative to p_2) by all members of the system.

Accepted with one sample, rejected with another.

(8) Given: S_1 and S_2 of the "same type" where S_1 is larger than S_2,

$p_x \supset S_1$ and $p_{x'} \supset S_2$ of the same type,

$p_y \supset S_1$ and $p_{y'} \supset S_2$ representing similar technical positions, then,

"support" of p_y by p_x, both of S_1, > support of $p_{y'}$ by $p_{x'}$, both of S_2.

Empirically supported where S_1 and S_2 were school systems, $p_x \equiv$ teachers, and $p_y \equiv$ school board members or superintendents.

(9) Not coded:

"In defining a line of authority in a formal organization, incumbents of any position (X) in a large formal organization will be less likely to accept or more likely to reject a deviation from the established line of authority, whether a by-pass or a non by-pass is established, than will incumbents of the same position (X) in small formal organizations."

When X $\equiv$ school board members in the formal organization of the public school, limited support was gained for the proposition.

Chapter 11:

(10) a. $\overset{+}{\text{length}}$ of interaction of $per_{1\ldots n} \supset p_{1\ldots n} \supset S_x \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; $per_{1\ldots n} \supset p_{1\ldots n} \supset S_x$; $p_2 \supset S_x$; - ; - ; - ; -].

As tested:

b. $\overset{+}{\text{length}}$ of interaction of school board with superintendent $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; $p_1 \equiv$ superintendent, $p_2 \equiv$ school board ; p_2 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Not Confirmed.

c. $\overset{+}{\text{length}}$ of interaction of school board members $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; school board members ; p_1, p_2 ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Confirmed.

d. $\overset{+}{\text{length}}$ of interaction of p_1 with p_2 $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in (10a) above]

if and only if $\overset{+}{\text{ratings}}$ of p_2 by p_1.

Not confirmed.

(11) $\overset{+}{\text{homogeneity}}$ of ftrs or traits, etc., among $\text{per}_{1\ldots n} \supset p_2 \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; $\text{per}_{1\ldots n} \supset p_2 \supset S_x$; $p_{1\ldots n} \supset S_x$; - ; - ; - ; -].

Hypotheses tested for $p_2 \equiv$ school board, $p_1 \equiv$ superintendent, such that $(p_1, p_2) \supset S_x$. Homogeneity was considered for the following:

a) educational progressivism (not confirmed)
b) political-economic conservatism (confirmed)
c) religion (confirmed)
d) "civic duty" motivation attributed by p_1 (not confirmed)
e) "special group representation" and "political experience" motivation attributed by p_1 (confirmed)
f) sex (not confirmed)
g) education level (confirmed)
h) income level (not confirmed)

(12) $\overset{+}{\text{homogeneity}}$ of ftrs, traits, etc. among positions $\supset S \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; $p_{1\ldots n} \supset S_x$; $p_{1\ldots n} \supset S_x$; - ; - ; - ; -].

Hypothesis derived and tested for $p_1 \equiv$ school board, $p_2 \equiv$ superintendent. The independent variable, homogeneity, was considered in regard to:

a) educational progressivism (not confirmed)
b) political-economic conservatism (not confirmed)
c) religion (not confirmed)
d) sex (not confirmed)
e) income level (not confirmed).

Chapter 12:

The following ten propositions were stated at a low level of generality:

(13) educational $\overset{+}{\text{progressivism}}$ of school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; school board, superintendent ; school board, superintendent ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Confirmed.

(14) educational $\overset{+}{\text{progressivism}}$ of superintendent $\Rightarrow$ ComCns [as in 13].

Not confirmed.

(15) political-economic $\overset{-}{\text{conservatism}}$ of school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; school board ; school board, superintendent ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Confirmed.

(16) political-economic $\overset{-}{\text{conservatism}}$ of school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in 13].

Not confirmed.

(17) "civic duty" $\overset{+}{\text{motivation}}$ of school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in 15].

Motivations attributed by superintendent. Confirmed.

(18) "special $\overset{+}{\text{group}}$ representation" and "political experience" motivation of school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in 15].

Motivations attributed by superintendent. Confirmed.

(19) $\overset{+}{\text{proportion}}$ of women on school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in 15].

Confirmed.

(20) $\overset{+}{\text{size}}$ of school board $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in 13].

Confirmed.

(21) $\overset{+}{\text{Urbanism}}$ of community $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as in 15].

Confirmed.

(22) $\overset{+}{\text{urbanism}}$ of community $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{Ownshr}}$ [as in 13].

Confirmed.

Chapter 13:

(23) $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ $[N ; - ; per_{1\ldots n} \supset p_1 ; p_{1\ldots n} ; - ; - ; - ; -] \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{gratification}}$ in position occupancy of $per_{1\ldots n}$.

Hypotheses derived for pos 1 ≡ school board, pos 2 ≡ superintendent. D. V. scale for rating satisfaction in participation in school board activities. Confirmed.

(24) $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ $[N ; - ; p_1, p_2; p_1 , p_2 ; - ; - ; - ; -] \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{high}}$ ratings of performance of p_1 by p_2 and vice versa.

Hypothesis derived and tested for 1) p_2 ≡ superintendent rating p_1 ≡ school board, and 2) p 1 rating p 2. First hypothesis confirmed. Second hypothesis not confirmed.

(25) $\overset{+}{\mathrm{OwnShr}}\ [N\ ;\ -\ ;\ p_2 \supset S_x\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -] \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{high}}$ ratings of p_2 by $p_1 \supset S_x$.

Hypothesis tested for $p_2 \equiv$ school board, $p_1 \equiv$ superintendent.
Confirmed.

Chapter 14:

(26) a. $\overset{+}{\mathrm{Con}}_1\ [N\ ;\ -\ ;\ p_1 \equiv$ a profession ; $per_1 \supset p_1\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -] \Rightarrow$

job $\overset{+}{\text{satisfaction}}$ of $per_2 \supset p_1$,

where $per_1 \equiv$ superordinate of per_2 in a hierarchical social system.

Proposition as tested:

b. $\overset{+}{\mathrm{Opt}}$ [superintendents ; school board members ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

superintendents' job $\overset{+}{\text{satisfaction}}$, career $\overset{+}{\text{satisfaction}}$, and $\overset{-}{\text{worry}}$ connected with positional activities.

Confirmed for job satisfaction and worry. Not confirmed for career satisfaction.

(27) a. $\overset{+}{\mathrm{OwnShr}}\ [N\ ;\ -\ ;\ (p_1 \equiv$ professional position, $p_2 \equiv$ non-professional position) $\supset S_x\ ;\ p_1, p_2\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -] \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\mathrm{Con}}_1\ [N\ ;\ -\ ;\ p_1\ ;\ p_2\ ;\ -\ ;\ -\ ;\ -]$.

Proposition as tested:

b. $\overset{+}{\mathrm{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; superintendents, school board ; superintendent, school board ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\mathrm{Opt}}$ [superintendents ; school board ; - ; - ; - ; -].

Confirmed.

(28) a. $\overset{+}{\mathrm{Con}}_1\ [N\ ;\ -\ ;\ p_1 \equiv$ professional position ; $p_2 \equiv$ non-professional position ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{evaluation}}$ of p_2 by p_1.

Proposition as tested:

b. $\overset{+}{\mathrm{Opt}}$ [superintendents ; school board ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{ratings}}$ by superintendent of school board on performance of several activities.

Confirmed.

(29) AttCns [AN's ; - ; - ; $\text{per}_1 \circlearrowright p_1$; $p_{2...n}$; per_1 ;

; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

gratification of per_1 from position occupancy.

Hypotheses derived for per 1 = school superintendent, $p_{2...n}$ = several alter positions. The hypotheses dealt with 4 areas of dissensus and was tested for dependent variables of (a) job satisfaction (confirmed), (b) career satisfaction (not confirmed), and (c) positional worry (partly supported).

Chapter 17:

This chapter consists of three assumptions which are interrelated to form a theory of conflict resolution with respect to these factors.

(30) Assumption one.

Lack of AttCns [AN ; - ; p_1 ; p_2, p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -]

$\Rightarrow$ one of the following:

a) a high degree of Con_2 [AN ; p_1 ; p_2 or p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -] ;

b) a high degree of Con_2 [AN ; p_1 ; p_2 and p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -] ;

c) lack of Con_2 [AN ; p_1 ; p_2 and p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -], an avoidance behavior.

(31) Assumption two.

AttCns [AN ; - ; p_1 ; p_2 and p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

Con_2 [AN ; p_1 ; p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -], where p_3 is seen as holding the more "legitimate" norm.

(32) Assumption three.

AttCns [AN ; - ; p_1 ; p_2 and p_3 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -]

Con_2 [AN ; p_1 ; p_2 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -], where p_2 is seen as the more capable of exercising negative sanctions.

A schema of 16 possible resolutions of role conflict, treating three ideal-type personalities, was devised from the preceeding assumptions, tested with school superintendents, and generally accepted.

17. Gullahorn, J. T. Measuring role conflict. American Journal of Sociology (1956), 61:299-303.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{amount}}$ of snc_2 [per_1 ; p_2 ; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; choice of x' ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [E, N ; - ; $\text{per}_1 \supset p_1, p\ 2$; per_1 ; - ; behavior x' ; - ; - ; -]

if and only if the affective evaluation by per_1 p_1 favors behavior x' over behavior x".

(2) a. $\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; p_1, p_2 ; $\text{per}_1 \supset p_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

"tendency to view the situation $\overset{+}{\text{unrealistically}}$, i.e., for the individual to try to accomplish more than is possible."

As tested:

b. $\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [as above] $\Rightarrow$

E [$\text{per}_1 \supset p_1$; - ; attempting more than is possible ; - ; - ; questionnaire].

Both hypotheses were tested and supported in experimental groups.

18. Hall, R. S. Social influences on the aircraft commander's role. American Sociological Review (1955), 20:292-299.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{cohesion}}$ of $S_1 \subset (p_1, p_2) \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; p_1 = crew, p_2 = commander ; crew ; - ; * ; crew ; - ; rating of statements].

*tested for behavior relating to "intimacy," "nurturance," "militariness."

(2) $\overset{+}{\text{attractiveness}}$ of S_1 for per_1 $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; $\text{per}_1 \supset p_1, p_2$; p_2 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; -],

where $(p_1, p_2) \supset S_1$.

(3) "$\overset{+}{\text{resultant}}$ of forces" on p_1 to remain in $S_1 \subset (p_1, p_2) \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{Con}}_1$ [N ; crew ; commander ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

(4) a. $\overset{+}{\text{cohesiveness}}$ of $S_1 \subset (p_1, p_2) \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{Ver}}$ [- ; N ; crew ; commander ; crew ; - ; - ; -].

As tested:

b. $\overset{+}{\text{cohesiveness}}$ of $S_1 \subset (p_1, p_2) \Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{Opt}}$ [crew ; commander ; crew ; * ; - ; - ; questionnaire].

*Tested for beh as in hypothesis #1.

An empirical study. Where not specified, p_1 represents aircraft crews while p_2 represents aircraft commanders. Propositions 1, 3, and 4 confirmed. Proposition 2 partially supported.

19. Hilmar, N. A. Conflicting social norms in a formal organization: a study of interpersonal expectations. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1955. Dissertation Abstracts (1955), 15:2589.

(1) "St$\overset{+}{a}$tus" of p_1 in a hierarchical S_1 $\Rightarrow$ C$\overset{+}{o}$n$_1$ [N ; S_1 ; p_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

(2) Ow$\overset{-}{n}$Shr [N ; - ; S_1 ; per$_n$; - ; behavior$_x$; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

At$\overset{+}{t}$Shr [AN ; - ; S_1 ; any per$_n \subset S_1$; - ; - ; behavior$_x$; - ; - ; -].

(3) E [per$_1 \subset S_1$; $p_1 \subset S_1$; - ; behavior$_x$; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

O$\overset{+}{p}$t [per$_1 \subset S_1$; $p_1 \subset S_1$; - ; behavior$_x$; - ; - ; -].

(4) Ow$\overset{-}{n}$Shr [N ; - ; S_1 ; $p_1 \subset S_1$; - ; behaviors x' and x" ; ss$_y$;

- ; -], when x' is the behavior prescribed by $p_1 \subset S_1$,

$\Rightarrow$ B$\overset{+}{e}$h [$p_1 \subset S_1$; - ; behavior x' ; ss$_y$; - ; -].

(5) Affective eval$\overset{+}{u}$ation of S_1 by per$_1 \subset S_1$ $\Rightarrow$ C$\overset{+}{o}$n$_2$ [AN ; per$_1$; S_1 ; - ; - ;

behavior$_x$; - ; - ; -].

(6) Affective eval$\overset{+}{u}$ation of S_1 by per$_1 \subset S_1$ $\Rightarrow$ "resi$\overset{+}{s}$tance to informal group pressures" to deviate from AN[per$_1 \subset S_1$;

S_1 ; - ; - ; behavior$_x$; - ; -].

(7) Uni$_2$ [$p_1 \subset S_1$; $p_2 \subset S_1$; $p_1 \subset S_1$; - ; behavior$_x$; ss$_y$; - ; -].

when there is Co$\overset{-}{m}$Cns [N ; - ; S_1 ; - ; - ; behavior$_x$; ss$_y$; - ; - ,

$\Rightarrow$ affective evaluation of p_2 by p_1.

Each of the propositions in this study were empirically tested and accepted using a U. S. Army company as the hierarchical system and squad members as p_1. P_2 represents squad leaders.

20. Hobart, C. W. Some effects of romanticism during courtship on marriage role opinions. Sociology and Social Research (1958), 42:336-43.

OwnShr $[^{N}_{E}$; - ; male and female adolescents ; married ; their ; - ;
at the "going steady age." couples spouses

marriage situations ; - ; -] >

OwnShr $[^{N}_{E}$; - ; post-courtship aged ; married ; spouses ; - ;
males and females couples

marriage situations ; - ; -].

Empirical. Accepted, no statistical analysis.

21. Jacobson, A. H. Conflict of attitudes toward the roles of husband and wife in marriage. *American Sociological Review* (1952), 17:146-50.

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ $[^{E}_{N}$; - ; husbands, wives; such husbands
or wives ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -]

=> $\overset{-}{\text{compatibility}}$.

Tested empirically and accepted.

22. Jacobson, E., Charters, W. W., and Lieberman, S. The use of the role concept in the study of complex organizations. *The Journal of Social Issues* (1951), 7:18-27.

a. $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ $[^{E}_{N}$; - ; union stewards, foremen; each other ; - ; - ; industrial

plant ; - ; -] => $\overset{+}{\text{ease}}$ of interpersonal relations.

as tested-

b. $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; - ; stewards, foremen ; stewards ; behavior relative to
furthering the ;
interest of followers

- ; - ; open-ended
questionnaire] => $\overset{+}{\text{ease}}$ of interpersonal relations.

Empirical confirmation reported but details of test not given.

23. Klapp, O. E. Social types: process and structure. *American Sociological Review* (1958), 23:674-678.

(1) Con$_1$ [E ; some member of the society, per$_y$; per$_x$; per$_y$; some

subset of the behaviors characteristic of a social type* ;

- ; - ; -] =>

Beh [per$_y$; per$_x$; in line with total set of ; - ; - ; -].
E's, N's, and C** for per$_x$

* 'social type' ≡ a high degree of ComCns [E, N, C** ; - ;

many members of ; - ; any relevant ; - ; - ; - ; -],
a society per$_x$

where C** ≡ a generalizing cognition that labels per x as having certain traits and typical behaviors; i.e., 'gladhander,' 'square.'

A theoretical paper.

24. Lieberman, S. The effects of changes in roles on the attitudes of role occupants. Human Relations (1956), 9:385-402.

(1) $\text{C}\overset{\neq}{\text{o}}\text{n}_1$ [N ; $\text{per}_{2\ldots n} \supset p_1$; $\text{per}_1 \supset p_1$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\text{Ow}\overset{+}{\text{n}}\text{Shr}$ [C* ; - ; $\text{per}_{2\ldots n} \supset p_1$, $\text{per}_1 \supset p_1$; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ;

-]. where C* ≡ "attitudes" in general.

(2) $\text{C}\overset{\neq}{\text{o}}\text{n}_1$ [N ; $\text{per}_{2\ldots n} \supset p_1$; $\text{per}_1 \supset p_1$; per_1 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -].

A theoretical discussion in an empirical paper. Neither proposition tested.

25. Manwiller, L. V. Expectations regarding teachers. Journal of Experimental Education (June, 1958), 26:315-54.

(1) $\text{At}\overset{+}{\text{t}}\text{Shr}$ [AN ; - ; school teachers, school board members ; community ; teachers ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] is the case in general.

An existential proposition that was not confirmed in empirical test.

(2) a. $\text{At}\overset{-}{\text{t}}\text{Shr}$ [as above] $\Rightarrow$ $\text{l}\overset{+}{\text{o}}\text{w}$ teacher morale.

as tested-

b. $\text{At}\overset{+}{\text{t}}\text{Shr}$ [as above] $\Rightarrow$ 1. teacher $\text{sati}\overset{-}{\text{s}}\text{faction}$
2. $\text{dr}\overset{+}{\text{o}}\text{p}$-out rate of teachers

26. Mason, W. S. and Gross, N. Intra-occupational prestige differentiation: the school superintendency. American Sociological Review (1955), 20:326-30.

(1) a. E[p_1 ; $\text{per}_n \supset p_1$; - ; behaviors relevant to achieving primary E-S of p_1 ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

prestige of per_n within p_1.

as tested-

b. E[p_1 ; $\text{per}_n \supset p_1$; - ; behavior x ; in schools ; - ; open ended questionnaire]
"standing" of per_n
$\Rightarrow$ E [per_1 ; per_n ; - ; relative to other members of p_1 ; - ; - ; paired comparisons].

An empirical study where p_1 represented school superintendents. Rejected.

27. Monk, M. and Newcomb, T. E. Perceived consensus within and among occupational classes. *American Sociological Review* (1956), 21:71-9.

(1) Aff$\overset{+}{\text{e}}$ctive evaluation of behavior x by per$_n$ p$_1$ => Att$\overset{+}{\text{C}}$ns [AN ; - ; per$_n$; per$_n$, p$_1$; - ; - ; x ; - ; - ; -].

(2) Affective evaluation of P$_1$ by per$_n$ p$_1$ ==> Att$\overset{+}{\text{C}}$ns [as above].

An empirical study where p$_1$ represented the working class and middle class. Both hypotheses were accepted by the authors.

28. Murphey, G. P. The social role of the prison chaplain. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956. *Dissertation Abstracts* (1957), 17:1142.

high degree of OwnShr[$^{N}_{E}$; - ; prison chaplains , wardens ; chaplains ; - ; - ; prison ; - ; -] is the case.

An empirical study. Accepted.

29. Olmsted, D. W. Inter-troup similarities of role correlates. *Sociometry* (1957), 20:8-20.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{C}}$on$_1$ [$^{E}_{N}$; per$_{2...n}$ $\supset$ grp$_x$; per$_1$ $\supset$ grp$_x$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] => group inv$\overset{+}{\text{o}}$lvement by per$_1$ for grp$_x$.

(2) Own$\overset{+}{\text{S}}$hr [$^{E}_{N}$; - ; per$_{2...n}$ $\supset$ grp$_x$, per$_1$ $\supset$ grp$_x$; per$_1$ $\supset$ grp$_x$; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] => group involvement by per$_1$ for grp$_x$.

Theoretical discussion in an empirical paper. Neither proposition was tested.

30. Orts, A. S. Study of conflicts related to happiness in marriage. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (1950), 45:691-9.

$\overset{+}{\text{C}}$on$_1$ [$^{N}_{E}$; husband ; wife ; husband ; wife's behaviors ; - ; - ; -] => aff$\overset{+}{\text{e}}$ctive evaluation of marriage by husband.

Empirical. Accepted on the basis of approximately 30 behavioral frameworks.

31. Pendelton, P. W. The academic role of the college student. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1956. *Dissertation Abstracts* (1956), 16:590.

(1) Own$\overset{+}{\text{S}}$hr [E ; - ; teachers ; students ; - ; behaviors$_{1...x}$; - ; - ; -] => Own$\overset{+}{\text{S}}$hr [E ; - ; parents ; students ; - ; behaviors$_{1...x}$; - ; - ; -].

Empirically rejected.

(2) Ow$\overset{+}{\text{n}}$Shr [E ; - ; per_1 (student), teachers, parents ; students ; - ;

$\text{behavior}_{1...x}$; - ; - ; -]. ⇒ academic perf$\overset{+}{\text{o}}$rmance of per_1

Empirical. Accepted.

32. Rapaport, R. and Rosow, I. An approach to family relationships and role performance. Human Relations (1957), 10:209-21.

OwnShr [N's ; - ; per_1, per_2 ; per_1, per_2 ; per_2, per_1, per_3 ; - ;

- ; - ; -] ⇒ Beh [per_3 ; per_1, per_2 ;

of a comp$\overset{+}{\text{e}}$tent, "healthy" nature ; - ; - ; -],

where $\text{per}_{1,2,\text{ and }3} \supset \text{family-grp}_x$ and per_3 is on leave from a mental hospital.

A theoretical and untested proposition in an empirical paper.

33. Raven, B. H., French, R. P., Jr. Group support, legitimate power and social influence. Journal of Personality (1958), 26:400-06.

(1) The attributed affective evaluation of per_2's occupancy of p_1 by per_1 to the other members of p_1 ⇒ The affective evaluation of per_2's occupancy of p_1 by per_1

(2) The affective evaluation of per_2's occupancy of p_1 by per_1, where per_1 is a subordinate in s_1 involving both per_1 and per_2 ⇒ The power of per_2 to influence per_1.

An empirical study using an experimental group where p_1 is the leader position. Both of the above were accepted.

34. Rommetveit, R. Social Norms and Roles. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

(1) Affective evaluation of p_1 by p_2 ⇒ 'potency' of p_1 over p_2.

(2) IndSnc [P_2 ; p_1, p_3 ; p_2 ; - ; - ; - ; - ; - ; - ; - ; - ; -] ⇒

'potency' of p_1 and p_3 over p_2.

(3) not coded:

The more intimately related the class of behaviors x are to A's goal, the greater is the 'potency' of A.

(4) 'potency' of $p_1$multiplied by (x' - x") $\Rightarrow$

Beh [p_2 ; - ; approaches x' ; settings 1...n ; - ; -],

for all cases in which

a lack of AttCns [N ; - ; p_2; p_1 , p_3 ; p_2 ; - ; -.x ;
settings 1...n ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

behavior x'

where x' is recommended by p_1 and x" is recommended by p_3, and x' > x" on an ordered behavioral scale.

(5) A lack of AttCns [same as in hypothesis 4],

where x' is the behavior recommended by p_1 and x" is recommended by p_3

$\Rightarrow$ Beh [p_2 ; - ; x"' ; settings 1...n ; - ; -]

where (x' - x"') and (x" - x"') are proportional to the respective potencies of p_1 and p_3 ,

if and only if the product of the 'potency' of p_1 (or p_3) times (x' - x") does not exceed a given value (undefined).

(6) aff$\overset{+}{\mathrm{e}}$ctive evaluation of per_1 by per_2 at $time_1$ $\Rightarrow$

Ow$\overset{+}{\mathrm{n}}$Shr [N_x ; - ; per_1, per_2 ; per_2 ; - ; x ; $\underset{1\ldots n}{\text{settings}}$; - ; -],

for any N_x [$per_1 \supset p_1$; $per_2 \supset p_2$; - ; x ; $\underset{1\ldots n}{\text{settings}}$; - ; -]

at $time_1$.

(7) (x' $\pm$ x") to a limit k between complete agreement and diametrical opposition.

$\Rightarrow$ A$\overset{-}{\mathrm{c}}$c [N ; AN ; p_2 ; p_1, p_3 ; p_2 ; - ; x ; $\underset{1\ldots n}{\text{settings}}$; - ; -],

for all cases of

lack of OwnShr [N ; - ; p_1, p_3 ; p_2 ; - ; x ; $\underset{1\ldots n}{\text{settings}}$; - ; -] ,

where x' is a behavior prescribed by p_1 and x" is prescribed by p_3.

Hypotheses one to seven are empirically demonstrated but given only informal support. There is inadequate statistical analysis to determine acceptability except for one and two. In each of the seven, p_1 represents parents, $p_2 \equiv$ school children of p_1, and $p_3 \equiv$ contemporaries of p_2.

(8) For all cases of a lack of ComCns [as in #7] ,

where p_1 is more potent than p_3 and where x' is the behavior prescribed by p_1 and x'' is that prescribed by p_3 for time$_1$,

a. potency of p_1 times (x' - x'') > some critical value k ⇒

AttCns [AN ; - ; p_2 ; p_1, p_3 ; p_2 ; - ; x ;

settings 1...n ; - ; -] at time$_1$ <

AttCns [as above] at time$_2$

b. potency of p_1 times (x' - x'') < k ⇒

AttCns [as above] at time$_2$ < AttComCns [as above] at time$_1$.

(9) The more precisely a manifest Beh [p_1 ; - ; x ; y ; - ; -] can be mapped on a continuum of possible behaviors

⇒ A$\overset{+}{\text{c}}$c [N ; AN ; p_1 ; p_2 ; p_1 ; - ; x ; y ; - ; -].

(10) An aff$\overset{+}{\text{e}}$ctive evaluation of p_1 by p_2 at any given time ⇒

increased similarity of dimensions utilized by p_1 and p_2 to structure any behavior, x, that is relevant to some norm.

Statements 8, 9, and 10 are from the author's theoretical discussion and were not tested. The occupants of the positions may be anyone.

35. Rose, A. M. The adequacy of women's expectations for adult roles. Social Forces (1951), 30:69-77.

(1) a. set of E [hcl that has some interaction with p_x ; any per $\supset$ p_x ; - ; content spe$\overset{+}{\text{c}}$ific, frameworks logically con$\overset{+}{\text{s}}$istent with one another ; - ; - ; -] ⇒

set of E [per$_1$ $\not\supset$ p_x ; per$_1$ cognized as future member of p_x ; - ; content spe$\overset{+}{\text{c}}$ific, frameworks logically con$\overset{+}{\text{s}}$istent ; - ; - ; -].

as tested-

b. set of E [people in general ; per$_x$ $\supset$ p_x $\equiv$ wife ; - ; content specific, frameworks logically c$\overset{-}{\text{o}}$nsistent with one another ; Western society ; - ; historical development noted informally] ⇒

set of E [young unmarried women ; themselves cognized as future wives ; husband, maids, etc. ; content specific, frameworks logically consistent with one another, several content areas ; - ; - ; questionnaire].

Not clearly tested. Some measure of support argued for.

(2) OwnShr [set of E ; - ; hcl as in proposition 1, $\text{per}_1 \not\supset p_x$. ; $\text{per}_x \supset p_x$. ; - ; content $\overset{+}{\text{specific}}$, frameworks logically $\overset{+}{\text{consistent}}$, otherwise unspecified ; - ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{happiness}}$ of $\text{per}_1 \supset p_x$ (at a later time).

Theoretical proposition.

36. Wardwell, W. I. The reduction of strain in a marginal social role. American Journal of Sociology (1955), 61:16-25.

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [E, N ; - ; - ; p_1 ; - ; $\text{behaviors}_{1\ldots x}$; 'professional' st ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$

"$\overset{+}{\text{tension}}$, anxiety or frustration" in persons occupying p_1.

An empirical study. $p_1 \equiv$ chiropractors. Anecdotal evidence.

37. Wispe, L. G. and Lloyd, K. W. Some situational and psychological determinants of the desire for structural interpersonal relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (1955), 51:57-60.

N [an insurance agent ; other members of the insurance company system ; all other members ; $\overset{+}{\text{predictibility}}$ of all behavior ; business situations ; - ; -] $\Rightarrow$ $\overset{-}{\text{sales}}$ production of the agent.

Empirical. Accepted.

38. Wispe, L. G. and Thayer, P. W. Role ambiguity and anxiety in an occupational group. Journal of Social Psychology (1957), 46:41-8.

$\overset{-}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [$\begin{matrix}E\\N\\P\end{matrix}$; - ; S_1 ; S_1 ; p_1 ; behaviors associated with S_1 ; - ; - ; -]

$\Rightarrow$ $\overset{+}{\text{anxiety}}$ in members of p_1.

An empirical study. $S_1 \equiv$ insurance company, $p_1' \equiv$ assistant district managers, $p_1'' \equiv$ agents, $p_1''' \equiv$ district managers.

Hypothesis accepted.

39. Videbeck, R. and Bates A. P. An experimental study of conformity to role expectations. Sociometry (1959), 22:1-11.

(1) $\overset{+}{\text{OwnShr}}$ [N ; veridical ; $\text{per}_{2\ldots n} \supset \text{grp}_x$; $\text{per}_1 \supset \text{grp}_x$;

- ; - ; - ; - ; -]. $\Rightarrow$ $\overset{+}{\text{strength}}$ of N as it impinges on $\text{per}_x 1$

(2) $\overset{+}{\text{Strength}}$ of N [$\text{per}_{2\ldots n} \supset \text{grp}_x$; $\text{per}_1 \supset \text{grp}_x$; - ; - ; - ; -

; -] $\Rightarrow$

$\overset{+}{\text{Co}}_1$ [N ; - ; $\text{per}_{1\ldots n} \supset \text{grp}_x$; $\text{per}_1 \supset \text{grp}_x$; - ; - ; - ; -].

From the theoretical discussion of an empirical paper. Hypotheses derived, tested, and confirmed.

REFERENCES

1. Barker, R. G. and H. F. Wright. Midwest and Its Children. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1954.

2. Biddle, Bruce J. "The Present Status of Role Theory." Studies in The Role of the Public School Teacher. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961.

3. Gross, N., W. S. Mason and A. W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958. (4,5,6,7,9).

4. Linton, R. The Cultural Background of Personality. London: Kegan Paul, 1947. (4)

5. Neiman, L. J. and J. W. Hughes. "The Problem of the Concept of Role: A Re-Survey of the Literature," Social Forces, Vol. 30, 1951.

6. Parsons, T. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951 (4,5).

7. __________ "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations - I," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 1, 1956.

8. Rommetveit, R. Social Norms and Roles. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954. (4,7,9)

9. Sarbin, T. R. "Role Theory," a chapter in Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I, G. Lindzey editor. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954. (4,5)